

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Quarterly

VOLUME XXXI

(New Series, Volume XX)

1949

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE OF JESUIT HISTORY
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXI

ARTICLES

CANTONMENT WILKINSONVILLE. <i>Norman W. Caldwell</i> . . .	3
THE CARTOGRAPHY OF THE MISSISSIPPI II. <i>Jean Delanglez</i> . . .	29
INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS IN ILLINOIS POLITICS 1837-1842. <i>John H. Krenkel</i> . . .	67
JAMES STUART'S JOURNEY UP THE RIVER MISSISSIPPI IN 1830. <i>W. H. G. Armytage</i> . . .	92
EARLY AGRICULTURE IN PIMERÍA ALTA. <i>Richard J. Morrissey</i> . .	101
ATTEMPTED MAYHEM ON PERE MARQUETTE. <i>Jerome V. Jacobsen</i>	109
THE EARLY THEATRE IN THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY. <i>Harold and Ernestine Briggs</i> . . .	131
THE YAKIMA CAMPAIGN OF 1856. <i>William N. Bischoff, S.J.</i> . .	163
DOCUMENTS: YAKIMA CAMPAIGN . . .	170
JEAN DELANGLEZ—IN MEMORIAM. <i>Jerome V. Jacobsen</i> . . .	209
CATTLE INDUSTRY IN COLONIAL BRAZIL. <i>Rollie E. Poppino</i> . .	219
THE AMATEUR THEATRE IN IOWA LIFE. <i>Barbara Brice</i> . . .	248
H. J. COKE ON THE OREGON TRAIL. <i>W. H. G. Armytage</i> . . .	258
BOOK REVIEWS . . .	53, 116, 270
NOTES AND COMMENTS . . .	57, 123, 213, 274
INDEX . . .	277

V

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 31, NUMBER 1

JANUARY 1949

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JANUARY 1949

VOLUME 31

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 20

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

CANTONMENT WILKINSONVILLE . . .	<i>Norman W. Caldwell</i>	3
THE CARTOGRAPHY OF THE MISSISSIPPI II . . .	<i>Jean Delanglez</i>	29
BOOK REVIEWS		53
NOTES AND COMMENTS		57

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON
PAUL KINIERY
JEAN DELANGLEZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JANUARY 1949

VOLUME 31

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 20

NUMBER 1

Cantonment Wilkinsonville

Cantonment Wilkinsonville may well be termed a new chapter in the life of General James Wilkinson. Historical students have given much attention to the career of Wilkinson and especially to his capacity for intrigue and plot in the Mississippi country. Less attention, however, has been given to his military activities in the west. Indeed, the entire field of military history of the American frontier might well be given more emphasis than has been the case in the past. The present study attempts to discuss a very important phase of military operations under Wilkinson between 1799 and 1803, with particular reference to military strategy on the lower Ohio—a strategy which was the brain child of Alexander Hamilton, but which was to be executed by Wilkinson after Hamilton had left the Army in 1800. This is the story of Cantonment Wilkinsonville, an important military post founded near the Grand Chain (present Pulaski County, Illinois) on the lower Ohio in 1801.

Local historians and antiquarians have long been aware of the fact that a large military post once stood just above the present site of United States Dam No. 53 at the head of the Grand Chain of Rocks on the Lower Ohio. It was known in a general way that Wilkinson had founded the post, but information as to when and why the post was founded was lacking.¹ That careful historians should also ignore the subject may be explained perhaps as follows: (1) Reference to Cantonment Wilkinsonville is not to be found in government publications and public documents. (The present writer is at a loss to explain how such an important military establishment could be omitted from the annual reports of the Secretary

¹ See William Henry Perrin, *History of Alexander, Union and Pulaski Counties, Illinois*, Chicago, 1883, 587. Perrin's query as to "Why he (Wilkinson) would lead a body of men to this spot...is something of a problem" is to the point.

of War and other official publications as printed in the *American State Papers* series. It may be suggested that the secrecy of the project was the reason why no official public reference to the venture was made.) (2) The relative inaccessibility of the military papers in the Adjutant General's Office had long kept the pertinent documents from coming to light. (3) There no doubt has been a tendency to confuse Cantonment Wilkinsonville with Fort Wilkinson, a post founded by Wilkinson in Georgia in 1801. Recent interest in the subject has led the present writer to undertake this study.²

General James Wilkinson had since 1784 been one of the outstanding figures in the west, succeeding George Rogers Clark as a leader of that section.³ Possessed of considerable military experience in the Revolution, adept at intrigue, and gifted with "a faculty for discerning the meaner motives of human nature, a smooth-quilled vocabulary, a not unimpressive personality . . . and an unfaltering conviction of his own importance and qualities of leadership," Wilkinson was bound to make a name for himself in the new west.⁴ Establishing his residence in Kentucky, Wilkinson immediately became involved in a plot to make that area independent of the United States with himself as head of a new state.⁵ Forestalled in this by the opposition of the State of Virginia, Wilkinson turned his attention to the river trade with New Orleans and after 1787 was cooperating with the Spanish, whose governor, Esteban Miro, was then interested in obtaining the friendship of the Kentuckians.⁶

² In 1929 the late Mrs. Ashbel Welch of Philadelphia, a descendant of Lieutenant Colonel David Strong, former post commandant at Cantonment Wilkinsonville, who died in 1801, attempted to locate Strong's grave. Since Strong was a veteran of the American Revolution, the Egyptian Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution undertook to assist Mrs. Welch in her search. The late William Nelson Moyers, then County Surveyor of Pulaski County, Illinois, made studies of the site of the Cantonment and later hired a researcher in Washington, D. C., to make a limited search among the military papers of the Adjutant General's Office. The results of Mr. Moyer's researches were published under the title of "A Story of Southern Illinois, the Soldier's Reservation, including the Indians, French Traders, and some early Americans", *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, XXIV, No. 1 (April, 1931), 26-104. In 1947 Mr. E. G. Lentz, Secretary of the Southern Illinois Historical Society, asked the present writer to undertake further researches on the subject. The notes of Mr. Moyer and certain materials collected by the Egyptian Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution are now in possession of the Southern Illinois Historical Society and have been consulted by the present author.

³ Isaac J. Cox, "James Wilkinson", *Dictionary of American Biography*, New York, 1936, XX, 222-226.

⁴ Samuel F. Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, Baltimore, 1926, 125.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 129 ff.

⁶ Henry Adams, *History of the United States During the Administration of Thomas Jefferson*, New York, 1930, III, 269.

A pensioner of the Spanish after 1792, Wilkinson nevertheless found his influence in the western country dwindling after the signing of Pinckney's Treaty.⁷

In 1796-1797 the west buzzed with rumors of a French plot against the United States, with Franco-Spanish attacks on the Illinois posts being feared.⁸ When the "X. Y. Z. Affair" brought on a grave crisis with the French government, steps were taken to strengthen the military forces in Illinois. General Wilkinson, then the ranking officer in the west after the death of General Wayne in 1796, was in charge of these preparations.⁹ At about the same time Spanish activities looking toward the building of a strong settlement at New Madrid, Missouri, caused uneasiness in the west. This scheme was calculated to influence Americans to desert their homes in Kentucky and Illinois and settle west of the Mississippi in Spanish territory.¹⁰ In 1797 came the "Tom Powers Plot", in which, if we may believe Humphrey Marshall, Wilkinson figured, involving plans for a *coup d'état* in Kentucky and the seizure of Fort Massac by the Spanish troops.¹¹

In all of these rumors, the central point of attention was Fort Massac, which commanded the lower Ohio region. A former French post, Massac had been rebuilt in 1794 at the time of the Genêt affair under orders of General Wayne.¹² Due to the increasing importance of the river trade, especially after 1795, Fort Massac was made the *entrepôt* for commerce moving to and from New Orleans.¹³ The importance of this traffic is indicated by the fact that within a three-months' period in 1800, 150 cargo boats and ves-

⁷ Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 347-349.

⁸ Arthur P. Whitaker, *The Mississippi Question*, New York and London, 1934, 120; *Kentucky Gazette*, Lexington, Kentucky, 4 February, 20 May, 3 June, 30 September, 1797.

⁹ Wilkinson to John Edgar and William St. Clair, 14 September, 1797, in Clarence W. Carter, Ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Washington, 1934, II, 627; Militia Orders, 22 September, 1797, 30 January, 1798, *ibid.*, 486-487, 499-500.

¹⁰ Max Savelle, "The Founding of New Madrid, Missouri", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XIX, No. 1, 30-56; Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 144-149; *Kentucky Gazette*, 2 September, 1797, 19 September, 1799. The Americans were offered large land grants and a restricted liberty of conscience.

¹¹ Humphrey Marshall, *History of Kentucky*, Frankfort, 1824, II, 221. According to Marshall, Wilkinson consulted with Powers at Detroit and then spirited him back to New Madrid.

¹² Clarence W. Alvord, *The Illinois Country*, Springfield, 1920, 411.

¹³ St. Clair to Secretary of State, 4 May, 1795; Wayne to Secretary of Treasury, 4 September, 1796, both in Carter, *Territorial Papers*, II, 516, 571. Alvord states that Massac was not made a port of entry for the collection of duties until 1799. *The Illinois Country*, 411-412. By 1800 some ninety persons lived near the fort. *Ibid.*, 407.

sels cleared Massac for the lower regions.¹⁴ In spite of the increase in commerce on the rivers the western settlements continually faced an unfavorable balance of trade which they sometimes tried to solve in unusual ways.¹⁵ By 1802 the demand for American produce at New Orleans had fallen perceptibly, though the river trade was still considerable.¹⁶ The fall in prices of produce was also striking.¹⁷ By 1799 galley craft of some size, pulled by oars, had appeared on the Ohio in the military service, and, in 1801, a brig negotiated the waterway from the mouth of the Muskingum to New Orleans, six weeks being required for this trip.¹⁸

The publication of the "X. Y. Z." dispatches in 1797 brought America and France to the verge of war. Alexander Hamilton, who previously had supported the Adams Administration in its policy of neutrality, now became a foremost advocate of war against the French. Forseeing the role the western country might play in such a struggle, Hamilton early in 1798 recommended the recruiting of a new brigade in the western settlements, the same to be placed under the command of Wilkinson for possible use in the event of war.¹⁹ Rumors were abroad concerning the retrocession of Louisiana to the French and the military authorities in the west were accordingly alerted against this eventuality.²⁰ The prospect of war with the

¹⁴ Quarterly Report of Commanding Officer at Fort Massac, Period, 1 September–1 December, 1800, as printed in *Philadelphia Gazette of the United States and Daily Advertiser*, 10 April, 1801. In the last nine months of the year 1800, 515 flatboats and barges passed Massac. Archer B. Hulbert, "Western Shipbuilding", *American Historical Review*, XXI, No. 4, 722. Flour, whiskey, pork, and cordage were the main items in this trade. See also *Country Gazette of the United States*, 24–28, September, 1801.

¹⁵ See for example the boycott on outside goods declared by Lexington, Kentucky, which stated that that city would no longer purchase certain enumerated articles from the outside "unless the same can be purchased and paid for in articles made of the growth or manufactures of this state." *Kentucky Gazette*, 13 March, 1800.

¹⁶ *The Guardian of Freedom*, Frankfort, Kentucky, 23 June, 15 September, 1802. By this time an insurance company had been founded in Kentucky to insure river cargoes and boats. *Ibid.*, 5, 19 February, 1802.

¹⁷ Tobacco, for example, fell in price from \$6.00 to \$6.25 per hundredweight in 1799 to \$3.00 to \$4.50 per hundredweight in 1800. Salt pork, however, was more dear in 1800 than in 1799. *Kentucky Gazette*, 25 July, 1799, 12 July, 1800.

¹⁸ McHenry to Hamilton, 12 April, 1799, *Hamilton Papers*, vol. 39 5383; McHenry to John Wilkins, 12 April, 1799, *ibid.*, 5384; *Country Gazette of the United States*, 5 August, 1801. In 1803 a "seafaring vessel" was built in Kentucky, but her description is not given. *The Guardian of Freedom*, 27 April, 1803.

¹⁹ "Measures in the War Department which it may be Expedient to Adopt", in Hamilton to McHenry, 16 January, 1798, in Henry Cabot Lodge, Ed., *The Works of Alexander Hamilton*, 6 vols., New York and London, 1886, VI, 147.

²⁰ McHenry to General Wilkinson, 8 July, 1798, in *Wilkinson Papers*, Chicago Historical Society.

French conjured up in Hamilton's mind visions of military glory for himself and his friends. These visions are believed to have given birth to schemes for the conquest, not only of Louisiana, but also of Latin America.²¹

Hamilton now entered the army as inspector and major general.²² His next move was to secure for himself the command of the troops north of Maryland, including, of course, the Northwest Territory.²³ In making this arrangement he had the support of General Washington.²⁴ At the same time, Hamilton asked for a report on the western troops. Both he and Washington were impatient at delays in recruiting the increased military forces which Congress had authorized. However, President Adams, who still maintained his resistance to the warmongers, was promoting the recruiting only half-heartedly.²⁵

Hamilton's schemes had now reached the point at which his theory of "defense by offense" would have to be implemented with more definite arrangements.²⁶ It was at this juncture that he ordered Wilkinson to New York for conference, an order which was not altogether unexpected by Wilkinson, it would seem.²⁷ The following points were drawn up for discussion with Wilkinson:

1. The disposition of our western inhabitants towards the United States and foreign powers.

²¹ Whitaker, *The Mississippi Question*, 116 ff.

²² Hamilton to McHenry, 28 July, 1798, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 90. Hamilton's appointment dates from 25 July, 1798. The new defense program voted by Congress called for substantial increases in the military and naval forces.

²³ Hamilton to Secretary of War, 24 January, 1799; Secretary of War to Hamilton, 4 February, 1799, Hamilton Papers, vol. 34, 4773, 4826-4831. See also Hamilton to Washington, 15 February, 1799, *ibid.*, vol. 35, 4856. In his letter of 24 January, 1799, Hamilton had also suggested that the troops in Tennessee and the Northwest Territory be placed under one officer, who in turn was "To be permitted to correspond immediately with the Inspector-General and receive orders from him". See Lodge, *Works*, VI, 150. Hamilton, however, did not get command of the troops in Tennessee. Hamilton to Washington, 15 February, 1799, in Wilkinson, *Memoirs of My Own Time*, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1816, I, 435.

²⁴ Washington to Hamilton, 25 February, 1799, Hamilton Papers, vol. 35, 4919.

²⁵ Hamilton to Wilkinson, 15 February, 1799, Wilkinson Papers, Chicago Historical Society; Washington to Hamilton, 25 February, 1799, Hamilton Papers, vol. 35, 4929-4930.

²⁶ See draft by Hamilton of Washington to McHenry, 13 December, 1798, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 102-103.

²⁷ Hamilton to Wilkinson, 12 February, 1799, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 154; Hamilton to Washington, 15 February, 1799, *ibid.*, 156. Hamilton stated in the first reference: "Much may be examined in a personal interview, which, at so great a distance, cannot be effected by writing." In the second reference he indicates the order to Wilkinson was in conformity with Washington's wishes. Wilkinson to Hamilton, 15 April, 1799, Hamilton Papers, vol. 39, 5412-5417.

2. The disposition of the Indians in the same aspect.
3. The disposition of the Spaniards in our vicinity—their strength in number and fortification.
4. The best expedients for correcting or contracting hostile propensities in any or all these quarters including—
5. The best defensive disposition of the western army, embracing the country of Tennessee—and the northern and northwestern lakes, and having an eye to economy and discipline.
6. The best mode (in the event of a *rupture with Spain*) of attacking the two Floridas. Troops, artillery, etc., requisite.
7. The best plan of supplying the Western army with provisions, transportation, forage, etc.
8. The best arrangement of command, so as to unite facility of communication with the sea-board, and the proper combination of all the parts under the general commanding the western army.²⁸

These points of discussion probably formed the basis for private conversations between the two men under another heading. That Hamilton was eager to win the westerner to his own way of thinking is indicated by his willingness to recommend the major-generalcy for Wilkinson, which had already been done on 15 June, 1799, while the latter was on his way to New York.²⁹

Wilkinson reached New York on the first day of August, 1799 and conversations between the two men began at once. The written recommendations which Wilkinson submitted to Hamilton and which Hamilton later transmitted to Washington have not been found, but from Wilkinson's *Memoirs* it is revealed that he favored concentrating the western forces on the lower Mississippi.³⁰ It is evident that Wilkinson had his heart in lower Louisiana and that he sought to bring Hamilton over to his point of view by stressing the ease with which the Spanish at New Orleans might be conquered "in one hour".³¹ On the other hand, Wilkinson conceded that the

²⁸ Hamilton to Wilkinson, 15 April, 1799, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 164; Wilkinson, *Memoirs*, I, 440.

²⁹ Hamilton to Washington, 15 June, 1799, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 181-182; *id.* to McHenry, 25 June, 1799, *ibid.*, 184. In his letter to Washington, Hamilton said: "I am aware that some doubts have been entertained of him, and that his character on certain sides, gives room for doubt." Nevertheless, Hamilton argued that Wilkinson was not only a valuable man to the government, but also that he might cause trouble "if neglected". It should be noted that Wilkinson did not receive his promotion until 1813 after having been nearly twenty years in grade. Washington refused to support Hamilton's request. See Bernard C. Steiner, *The Life and Correspondence of James McHenry*, Cleveland, 1907, 396.

³⁰ Wilkinson, *Memoirs*, I, 437 ff.; Wilkinson to Hamilton, 4 September, 1799, *ibid.*, I, 453. Wilkinson wanted only one regiment of infantry and two companies of artillery assigned to the entire northwest, including the garrison at Fort Massac. He recommended that three regiments of infantry "be ordered to the Mississippi."

³¹ Wilkinson to Hamilton, 4 September, 1799, in Wilkinson, *Memoirs*, I, 447.

Ohio could not be left defenseless. To meet this need he recommended a "river navy of decided superiority."³²

Hamilton, however, was not disposed to favor the concentration of troops on the lower Mississippi. McHenry, the Secretary of War, had first quarreled with Wilkinson and then with Hamilton over the construction of the post at Loftus Heights, Mississippi, which Wilkinson had already begun in 1797 as the point of concentration of the American forces.³³ That Hamilton came to Wilkinson's defense in this instance would seem to have been due to his eagerness to gain the good will of his subordinate and not due to his own convictions, which, as will be seen below, were in favor of a concentration on the lower Ohio.³⁴ Hamilton even went so far as to refuse tacitly to relay McHenry's orders to Wilkinson calling for a suspension of construction at Loftus Heights.³⁵

What actually took place in the conferences between Wilkinson and Hamilton will probably never be known. Hamilton's report to Washington after the conferences, along with which he submitted Wilkinson's proposals, was definitely opposed to the concentration of American troops on the lower Mississippi; indeed, Hamilton recommended that only a battalion of infantry and a company of artillery be distributed among the southern forts. In this same letter he revealed that he favored the establishment of a reserve corps "in the vicinity of the rapids of the Ohio." In defense of this plan Hamilton pointed out that such a concentration would be less antagonistic to the Spanish, while at the same time it would afford better oversight of the northern Indians and "the disaffected of the neighboring country" (*i.e.*, Kentucky).³⁶ It must be assumed that by this time Hamilton had won Wilkinson to his views, and in further conferences held at Trenton, New Jersey, early in October, 1799, definite agreements were reached in regard to the disposition

³² *Ibid.*, 448. Henry Adams refers to the fact that Jefferson once thought of defending the Mississippi with "gunboats". Adams, *History*, I, 487.

³³ Writing early in 1799, McHenry accused Wilkinson of causing apprehension among the Spanish by this move and opined that "it would have been more in unison with my sentiments, to have retained the principal body nearer to the Ohio". McHenry to Wilkinson, 31 January, 1799, Wilkinson Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

³⁴ See Wilkinson to Hamilton, 15 April, 1799, Wilkinson Papers, Chicago Historical Society, McHenry to Hamilton, 8 November, 1799, Hamilton to McHenry, 12 November, 1799, Hamilton Papers, vol. 60, 9629-9631, 9720-9722.

³⁵ Hamilton to McHenry, 12 November, 1799, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 256-260.

³⁶ Hamilton to Washington, 9 September, 1799, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 206-212.

of the troops in the west, including the establishment of the reserve force on the Ohio.³⁷

The exact site for such an establishment had yet, however, to be determined. At first Hamilton was of the opinion that the site should "not be . . . more westward or southward than the vicinity of the rapids of Ohio".³⁸ He had in mind an establishment with a strength of 3000 men which would serve as a corps about which the western militia might rally for defensive operations or for the offense in case a rupture with Spain should induce the Americans to attack Louisiana.³⁹ Such was the official plan as adopted by the end of October, 1799. What private schemes, if any, may have been agreed upon by Hamilton and Wilkinson cannot be determined from the existing evidence.

In preparation for the execution of the plan all officers of the western regiments on leave or furlough were called to duty, these men being instructed to report directly to Hamilton.⁴⁰ Steps were taken at this time also to tighten the discipline of the troops already posted in the west.⁴¹ Fort Massac, formerly subject to the control of the commandant at Fort Stoddard (Loftus Heights, Mississippi) was now placed under the northern division.⁴² Early in November, Hamilton began negotiations with the military contractor concerning the provision of rations for the proposed establishment.⁴³

³⁷ Hamilton to Secretary of War, 6 October, 1799, in Hamilton Papers, vol. 56, 8999; Hamilton to James Miller, 7 October, 1799, *ibid.*, 9028; Hamilton to Secretary of War, 12 October, 1799, *ibid.*, vol. 57, 9096-9099. In the latter reference Hamilton evidently had his eye on the Fort Massac area, which he stressed as commanding the confluence of the Tennessee and the Cumberland Rivers with the Ohio. He refers to the necessity of the construction of additional "respectable fortifications".

³⁸ Hamilton to Wilkinson, 31 October, 1799, in Hamilton Papers, vol. 59, 9472-9475. He was also not decided as to which bank of the river should be used for such a concentration, though he seemed to prefer the south side, since rations were cheaper in Kentucky.

³⁹ Hamilton to McHenry, 12 October, 1799, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 240-242. With this letter, Hamilton enclosed a plan for the number of river boats necessary for the movement of such a force. This plan has not been found.

⁴⁰ Order of McHenry, 2 September, 1799, in *Kentucky Gazette* (Extra), 7 November, 1799.

⁴¹ Hamtramck to Hamilton, 5 October, 1799, in Hamilton Papers, vol. 56, 8968-8972.

⁴² Commanding Officer, Mount Adams (near Natchez), to Commanding Officer, Fort Massac, 11 October, 1799, in Letters Sent, Commanding Officer, Troops in Mississippi Territory, July, 1799-May, 1800, 67-68. Unless otherwise stated references to military documents are taken from materials in the Old Records Section of the Adjutant General's Office, now in the National Archives.

⁴³ Hamilton to James O'Hara, 6 November 1799, in Hamilton Papers, vol. 60, 9595-9596. Here Hamilton indicates that 1320 daily rations would be needed after the first day of the following August (1800). Curiously enough, he mentions increasing the daily rations at Fort Massac to 1000

At this juncture the plans of Hamilton seem to have encountered difficulties. For reasons not clear the creation of the reserve force was slow to materialize and after November, 1799, no more is heard of the development planned for the site at the Falls of the Ohio.⁴⁴ At the same time Hamilton wrote of the advisability of establishing a strong post in the vicinity of Fort Massac; this evidently was the germ of Cantonment Wilkinsonville. Why his attention should have been drawn to this new site is puzzling. In his letter to Wilkinson at the end of October Hamilton wrote:

The importance of securing and commanding the confluence of the rivers Tennessee and Cumberland with the Ohio, and of the latter with the Mississippi has been duly felt by you. The selection of a spot most eligible for a strong fort, with a view to this object and the kind of work which it will be proper to establish, are worthy of your early and careful consideration. You must, however, bear in mind that it is to be successively effected by the labor of the troops. A garrison of five hundred men may be the standard of the dimensions. You will report to me the result of your investigations on this subject.⁴⁵

Had Wilkinson succeeded in drawing Hamilton closer to the Mississippi?

It is certain that by this time Hamilton had begun to despair of getting his war with France. Adams' determination to send a new ambassador to France just when Hamilton was making every effort to recruit his army was very discouraging. Also the death of Washington in December, 1799, had removed Hamilton's closest friend and supporter. When it became evident that Adams' mission would succeed in making an agreement with the French, Hamilton resigned his commission. When a convention of peace was finally

in the meantime, these requirements to be reduced later to 100 daily rations. This would seem to indicate that Hamilton, while planning to concentrate the forces at the Falls of the Ohio, at the same time also contemplated strengthening the complement at Massac.

⁴⁴ At the end of October, Hamilton was still debating the choice of sites and seems to have decided upon a location on the south side of the river. Hamilton to Wilkinson, 31 October, 1799, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 247-248; Hamilton to Secretary of War, 8 November, 1799, Hamilton Papers, vol. 60, 9627-9628.

⁴⁵ Hamilton to Wilkinson, 31 October, 1799, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 252. In the same letter, however, Hamilton makes reference to plans for the establishment at the falls of the Ohio, thus indicating that at this point he had not abandoned the former project. He instructed Wilkinson to make his headquarters there in the following spring. *Ibid.* It may be suggested that the destruction of the War Department records in the fire of November, 1800, may account in large part for the lack of information at this point. On 8 November, 1800, the War Office and its records were burned. Samuel Dexter to Simeon Hart, 24 December, 1800, Military Book, 10 November, 1800-17 November, 1803, 1; also Dexter to Speaker of the House, 12 February, 1801, *ibid.*, 63-67.

signed between the Americans and the French in September, 1800, all plans for war were necessarily abandoned.⁴⁶ It is not possible to determine what took place in regard to the western project during this period. Under such circumstances, it seems surprising that the project to locate a strong military force on the lower Ohio was not dropped. Nevertheless, this was not the case, and when the records again became available (after the War Department fire in November, 1800), plans were already far advanced for the construction of the post at Grand Chain.⁴⁷

It now becomes clear that Wilkinson was to make his own headquarters at Pittsburgh and that the area from Niagara to Fort Massac was to be assigned to Colonel John F. Hamtramck.⁴⁸ Subordinate to Hamtramck was Lt. Col. David Strong, who commanded the Second Regiment of Infantry, which organization had been chosen to open the cantonment.⁴⁹ Tools and special supplies were being collected for use at the cantonment by early November, 1800.⁵⁰ The contract for rations for the western posts was amended so as to include the rations "that will be requisite at the intended Cantonment on the Ohio".⁵¹ It seems, however, that even at this date the

⁴⁶ For the bitter disappointment of Hamilton and his associates at this turn of events see Washington to Hamilton, 27 October, 1799, Hamilton Papers, vol. 58, 9384-9385; Wilkinson, *Memoirs*, I, 458. In May, 1800 McHenry ordered the extra military personnel which had been recruited for the French war discharged by 14 June. McHenry to Dearborn, 24 May, 1800, in Military Book, 1800-1803, 232. It is notable that this order was issued even before the French convention was signed. Hamilton resigned on 2 July, 1800. Hamilton to McHenry, 2 July, 1800, in Lodge, *Works*, VI, 309.

⁴⁷ There is no evidence of an establishment at this site earlier than 1801. It is possible, of course, that expeditions travelling on the river may have used the site for camping temporarily. Wilkinson may have stopped there in 1798, since several orders were issued in August of that year from "Camp near Massac". General Orders 8, 9, 10, 11 August, 1798, in Wilkinson Order Book, 1797-1808, 126-130.

⁴⁸ Hamtramck to Hamilton, 25 December, 1799, in Hamilton Papers, vol. 54, 8707; Wilkinson to Hamtramck, 6 November, 1799, *ibid.*, vol. 60, 9598.

⁴⁹ Wilkinson to Hamtramck, 6 November, 1799, in Hamilton Papers, vol. 60, 9597; General Order, Headquarters, Washington, 30 November, 1800, Wilkinson Order Book, 269.

⁵⁰ Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 November, 1800, in War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W 315; Secretary of War to Samuel Hodgdon, 12 November, 1800, in War Office, Order Book, 1800-1805, 2-3.

⁵¹ Secretary of War to Edward Thomson, 13 November, 1800, in Military Book, 10 November, 1800-17 November, 1803, 1. Thomson, the contractor, signed bond and contract to furnish the extra supplies. Thomson to Dexter, 24 November, 1800, *ibid.*, 5. It is interesting to note that Wilkinson submitted correspondence in behalf of "Mr. Orrs Brother relating to contract and supply of the troops at the mouth of the Ohio on the N.W. side of that river." This bid evidently reached Dexter (Secretary of War) too late for action. Wilkinson to Dexter, 11 November, 1800, War Office,

official War Department approval of the project had not been granted—at least Wilkinson had not received it, for on 1 December he wrote asking for orders “to sanction the Cantonement &c on the NW of the Ohio . . .”⁵²

Early in November the troop movement from Pittsburgh began, but the expedition did not reach Marietta until a month later.⁵³ By mid-January, 1801, the troops were on the site at Grand Chain.⁵⁴

Little is known concerning the construction of the military installations at Cantonment Wilkinsonville,⁵⁵ but detailed information is available concerning the establishment and operation of the commissary at the post.⁵⁶

The commissary agent, John R. Williams, assumed his duties at

Letters Received, 1800–1802, W 315. Rations were contracted for at fifteen cents each for this post as well as for Massac and other nearby posts. In general the cost of rations above the Ohio was then eighteen cents. Agreement between the Secretary of War and Edward Thomson, 4 September, 1800, in Wilkinson Papers, Chicago Historical Society. Thomson was a Philadelphia merchant. The daily ration for the United States Army in 1800 consisted of the following: 18 oz. of bread or flour (or 1 qt. rice or 1½ lbs. of corn meal), 1¼ lbs. fresh beef (or 1 lb. salt beef or ¾ lb. salt pork; if fresh meat was used, salt was to be furnished at the rate of two quarts per 100 rations), soap at the rate of 4 lbs. per 100 rations, candles at the rate of 1½ lbs. per 100 rations. In addition “It is expected the proposals will also extend to the supply of rum, whiskey, or other ardent spirits”. These were to be furnished at the rate of ½ gill per ration and vinegar at the rate of 2 qts. per 100 rations. War Department, Advertisement for Bids, 12 March, 1800, *Kentucky Gazette*, 17 April, 1800.

⁵² Wilkinson to Dexter, 1 December, 1800, War Office, Letters Received, 1800–1802, W 315. This sanction was officially given in Dexter to Wilkinson, 2 December, 1800, Military Book, 1800–1803, 11.

⁵³ The first evidence of movement from the rendezvous at Montour's Island is reported as taking place 8 November. John R. Williams to Mrs. James O'Hara, 9 November, 1800, in Williams Papers, Michigan Historical Collections. The author expresses his indebtedness to Dr. F. Clever Bald, Assistant Director of the Michigan Historical Collections, for locating and making available in microfilm this very valuable collection of materials. On John R. Williams, see below See also Williams to William Wusthoff, 2 December, 1800, *ibid.*; Wilkinson to Dexter, 28 December, 1800, War Office, Letters Received, 1800–1802, W 317; same to same, 9 January, 1801, in *ibid.*

⁵⁴ Williams to Matthew Adams, 15 January, 1801, Williams Papers; Williams' Receipt for Provisions, 25 January, 1801, *ibid.*; Wilkinson to Dexter, 6 February, 1801, War Office, Letters Received, 1800–1802, W 318.

⁵⁵ The earliest reference to the name of the post which has been found is in the letter written by Wusthoff to Williams dated 27 January, 1801 and addressed: “Mr. John Williams Wilkinson Ville”. Williams Papers. The place was officially called “Cantonement Wilkinsonville”.

⁵⁶ Prior to his appointment as contractor's agent at Wilkinsonville, John R. Williams was a cadet in the Second Regiment of Infantry. See Receipt of Captain William Gilkinson for Williams' Passage from Detroit to Fort Erie, 8 June, 1800, Williams Papers. Williams later became a wealthy merchant and banker and was the first elected mayor of the city of Detroit. Dr. F. Clever Bald to the author, 28 April, 1948.

Pittsburgh at the time of the organization of the expedition.⁵⁷ He accompanied the expedition down the Ohio, being in charge of issues of all provisions during that period. The commissary at Wilkinsonville was established under his direction and remained under his charge as late as October, 1801.⁵⁸

That the position of the civilian commissary attached to a military unit in the army of that period was not an enviable one is revealed in the Williams correspondence. From the beginning of the expedition complaint is heard of "the Repeated misbehaviour" of the troops, some of whom had been taken "all Drunk, & Taping a Barrel of Whisky." Others had broken into barrels of provisions.⁵⁹ Losses of stores of course brought the censure of the contractor upon his agent.⁶⁰

Another problem with which the agent wrestled was that of procuring help in unloading and storing supplies. Colonel Strong from the beginning took the viewpoint that military personnel and military horses should not be used in such work, though he was obliged at times to abandon this position.⁶¹ The new contractor, Ormsby, planned to send a horse and dray to the Cantonment, but this plan was not carried out because of its "inconvenience."⁶² Prolonged bad weather in March and April, 1801, caused Williams much delay and trouble in getting supply boats loaded and the pro-

⁵⁷ Williams to Mrs. James O'Hara, 6 November, 1800, Williams Papers. At this time Williams was inquiring concerning his duties, the term of his employment, and so on, all of which he was anxious to know "before I descend the River". Williams was at first in the immediate employ of Colonel James O'Hara, the subcontractor. After March, 1801, he was employed in the same capacity by the new subcontractor, Oliver Ormsby. As late as 15 December, Williams still had no official notice of his appointment. Williams to, 15 December, 1800; Ormsby to Williams, 17 January, 1801; same to same, 1 February, 1801; Williams to Col. David Strong, 3 March, 1801, all in Williams Papers.

⁵⁸ Receipt of Charles Wilkins, 9 October, 1801, Williams Papers. At this time Williams turned over certain supplies to Wilkins, who was evidently succeeding him as agent. Ormsby, the new subcontractor, visited Wilkinsonville in May, 1801, spending several weeks there. Williams to Ormsby, 25 April, 1801; Articles of Agreement between William Chribbs and Oliver Ormsby, 16 May, 1801; Ormsby to Williams, 19 June, 1801, all in Williams Papers. As late as July, 1801 Williams had not closed his accounts with Colonel O'Hara, the former subcontractor. Wusthoff to Williams, 29 July, 1801, in *ibid.*

⁵⁹ Williams to Strong, 26 November, 1800, Williams Papers. Again Williams writes: "There has been several Casks of Beef and flour Opened, and partly Stolen, also Whisky in the different Boats, that were under charge of non Commissioned Officers..." Williams to, 15 December, 1800, in *ibid.*

⁶⁰ See, for example, Ormsby to Williams, 3 March, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁶¹ Williams to, 15 December, 1800, Williams Papers.

⁶² Ormsby to Williams, 3 March, 1801, Williams Papers.

visions stored.⁶³ It seems this problem was never satisfactorily solved.

A third problem met by Williams was that of his personal relations with Colonel Strong, the post commandant. Friction between the two undoubtedly grew out of Williams' complaints against the troops and the matter of Strong's refusal to cooperate with him in unloading and storing provisions. The trouble came to a head when Strong sought to displace Williams as commissary agent. According to Strong, Williams had stated that he would not serve under the new contractor, Ormsby, who was to begin issues at the Cantonment on the first of March, 1801. Strong therefore took it upon himself to hire another man to function in Williams' room until Ormsby himself should arrive at the post to survey his affairs.⁶⁴ Williams was forced to surrender the storehouse keys to Strong's appointee.⁶⁵ In the end Strong was obliged to bow down when Williams was supported by Ormsby.⁶⁶

On another occasion the military authorities alleged that Williams or his assistants were selling liquor to the troops in direct violation of a general order. The appearance of unlicensed sutlers at the post was also mentioned, and Williams was duly warned against their activities.⁶⁷

On the other hand Williams was often forced to depend upon the officers of the post, from whom he borrowed money when in need. Only in the last extremity was he authorized to draw bills

⁶³ "... I have met with Considerable Difficulties in getting the Stores Hawled up as the Hill is very miry and Steep." Williams to Daniel Conner, 8 April, 1801, Williams Papers. The Quartermaster, however, came to his rescue at this time and gave assistance. Williams to Conner, 6 April, 1801, in *ibid.* A month later, however, we hear that the Colonel was adamant in his determination not to allow Williams to use the government's teams. Williams to Ormsby, 10 May, 1801, in *ibid.*

⁶⁴ Strong to Williams, 1 April, 1801, Williams Papers. Strong's letter is truculent. He ordered Williams to come to see him and warned him, saying, "My friend, ... I expect the fare [sic] game".

⁶⁵ Williams, who, it seems, had really decided to leave at first, now fought back and determined to stay. Strong's attempt to poison Conner against Williams failed. Williams to Conner, 6 April, 1801; Conner to Williams, 30 April, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁶⁶ Williams writes, telling how Strong then came to him wanting "to know whether or not I had any further Services for Mr. Wilson. I Replied that I had nothing to do with Mr. Wilson that I had not employed him—prior—nor did I want his Services..." Strong was accordingly obliged to accept Williams as agent and to order Wilson and Huston, the men he had supported, to obey Williams. Williams further adds that Strong admitted "that he had nor has nothing to do with the Contractors Business". Williams to Conner, 16 April, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁶⁷ Lt. D. Hughes, Adjutant of the Second Regiment, to Williams, 11 August, 1801. Only one sutler, a Mr. Morton, had been authorized to trade at the post.

upon the contractor directly.⁶⁸ That he sometimes was asked to collect bills owed by the officers to the contractor may not have endeared him to the military personnel.⁶⁹

The supply of provisions at the post seems to have been maintained without serious difficulty. The contractor, who received fifteen cents per ration for provisions issued, estimated that each ration cost him twelve cents, seven mills.⁷⁰ From his margin of profit, costs of transportation, wages and salaries of agents and workmen, losses due to theft and spoilage, and other charges had to be paid. Boats consigned to Wilkinsonville were loaded at Pittsburgh or Cincinnati and conducted to their destination under contract with boatmen, who delivered the cargoes to Williams and returned receipts therefor to the contractor or his agent.⁷¹ Some rations were drawn from stores remaining at Fort Massac when that post was aban-

⁶⁸ Ormsby to Williams, 3 March, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁶⁹ Conner to Williams, 9 July, 1801, in *ibid.*

⁷⁰ The cost of a ration was apportioned, according to this estimate, as follows:

Bread or flour	4 cents
Meat	5 cents
Liquor	2 cents
Small parts	1 cent, 7 mills

Total: 12 cents, 7 mills

The so-called "small parts" in each hundred rations were estimated as follows:

4 lbs. soap @ 20 cents.....	\$0.80
2 qts. salt @ 24 cents.....	.48
1½ lbs. candles @ 26 cents.....	.39
2 qts. vinegar @ 1½ cents.....	.03

Total: \$1.70

Note on Invoice of Provisions Received, 30 March, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁷¹ During the early stages of the voyage down the river Williams himself received some supplies directly at various points along the upper course of the river. Wusthoff to Williams, Pittsburgh, 8 November, 2 December, 1800; Charles Mayersbach to Williams, 21 November, 1800, Williams Papers. On a few occasions provisions were taken down to the post by an army officer who was making the trip. Receipt of Williams to Captain Claiborne, 5 December, 1800; Ormsby to Williams, 3 March, 1801, in *ibid.* Some idea of the cargoes carried by the boats may be gained from the inventory of the two cargoes which reached Wilkinsonville on 30 March, 1801. Williams reported the arrival of the following:

55 barrels pork
100 barrels whiskey
100 barrels flour
22 barrels soap
29 boxes candles

Williams to Strong, 31 March, 1801, Williams Papers. One of the hazards of the trip down the river was that incident to passing the falls at the site of the present city of Louisville. Fees of four dollars were paid to pilots who took boats over the falls. Inventory of Provisions Sent to Wilkinsonville by John Bishop, undated, Williams Papers.

done.⁷² Shipments of provisions to the post were heavy during the period March-July, 1801. No mention of consignments has been found after mid-September.⁷³

The reader is impressed by the enormous quantities of liquor consigned to the establishment, this seemingly being out of proportion to the amount of liquor called for in the number of rations issued. On two occasions consignments of 100 barrels of this item reached the post, not to mention smaller quantities sent.⁷⁴ Also of interest is a large shipment of stationery, including among other things various grades of paper, a ledger book, day books, blank books, memorandum books, forty almanacs, quills, ink powder, etc.⁷⁵

To avoid the evils incident to the continued use of salt meat efforts were made to secure fresh beef, especially during the summer of 1801. Live cattle were procured from Kentucky and from Cape Girardeau in Louisiana (now Missouri), though evidently not in great numbers.⁷⁶ The slaughter of cattle made necessary the establishment of a butcher at the post, one Joe Eveleth being hired for this work.⁷⁷

A bakery was also established at the Cantonment, this being done on the advice of General Wilkinson, if we may believe Orms-

⁷² For the abandonment of Fort Massac, see below, The authorization for the removal of the provisions is found in Wusthoff to Williams, 27 January, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁷³ Williams to Strong, 31 March, 1801; Williams to Ormsby, 6 April, 1801; Williams to Conner, 6 April, 1801; Ormsby to Williams, 16 May, 23 May, 1801; Cargo Receipt by John Bellwood, 23 May, 1801; Cargo Receipt by William and John King, 30 June, 1801; Conner to Williams, 30 June, 1801; same to same, 6 July, 1801; Inventory of Supplies sent by John Bishop, undated; Conner to Williams, 15 September, 1801, all in Williams Papers. Once Williams was reminded to acknowledge arrivals promptly. Conner to Williams, 29 August, 1801, in *ibid*.

⁷⁴ See again Williams to Strong, 31 March, 1801; Ormsby to Williams, 23 May, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁷⁵ Undated Invoice, Received by Williams 30 March, 1801, Williams Papers. This bill, including a few miscellaneous items, amounted to \$64.37.

⁷⁶ Ormsby authorized Williams to pay \$3.25 per hundred weight for live cattle delivered at the post. Kentucky cattle were driven across the Ohio when the river was low. A farmer nearby took the hides at the rate of three hides for the cost of a hundred pounds of beef. One John Feckland (?) contracted to supply 100 head of cattle. Ormsby to Williams, 19 June, 7 July, 1801, Williams Papers. Louis Lorimier of Cape Girardeau delivered at least one drove of cattle to Williams. Lorimier to Williams, 8 July, 1801 (French text), in *ibid*. In addition to fresh meat, bacon seems to have been sought after at the post. Some was sent down and it was suggested that if it could not be issued at a favorable figure it could be sold to the officers. Conner to Williams, 6 July, 1801, *ibid*.

⁷⁷ Eveleth, hired for six dollars per month, is described as "a good butcher, and a Carefull Fellow", but Williams was warned that "it will be necessary to keep him from liquor". Another assistant to Williams got fifteen dollars per month. Conner to Williams, 6 July, 1801, Williams Papers.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

by. It does not seem, however, that the contractor was obliged to bake bread and no evidence of extra remuneration for this service has been found. One hint as to the reason for the establishment of the bakery is found in a statement by Williams that a quantity of bad flour unfit for issue might be used when the bakery opened.⁷⁸ One William Chribbs of Randolph County, Indiana Territory (now Illinois) was hired as baker. His bakery went into operation in May, 1801.⁷⁹

Complete figures on the flow of provisions at Wilkinsonville cannot be given. A report for the period November, 1800-10 March, 1801 submitted to Colonel Hamtramck has not been found.⁸⁰ Likewise no report is available for the period after 1 July, 1801. The status of the commissary as of 1 April, 1801 and 1 July, 1801 was summarized by Williams as follows:⁸¹

Report of Provisions at Wilkinsonville, 1 April, 1801

On hand, 10 March, 1801:

Rations:	Meat	Flour	Whiskey	Soap	Candles	Vinegar	Salt
	69,652	44,051	24,206	82,085	165,332	12,000	5,400

Received since that date:

	17,009	17,422	206,704	111,675	134,200
Totals:	86,661	61,473	230,910	193,760	299,532	12,000	5,400

Issued and Expended:

	14,215½	14,415½	17,071	14,215½	14,583	800
--	---------	---------	--------	---------	--------	-------	-----

On Hand, 1 April, 1801:

	72,445½	47,057½	213,839	179,544½	289,949	12,000	4,600
--	---------	---------	---------	----------	---------	--------	-------

⁷⁸ This flour was part of a cargo that had been sunk at Pittsburg. Complaint was raised against its issue at the post and a board of enquiry was appointed to inspect it. Williams says, "In order to avoid Condemnation, I exchanged the Flour, without allowing the Court-Inspection..." He then suggested it might be used later in the bakery. Williams to Ormsby, 10 May, 1801; Ormsby to Williams, 3 March, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁷⁹ See contract between Chribbs and Ormsby, 16 May, 1801, Williams Papers. Chribbs, who was indebted to Ormsby, agreed to bake, producing 120 pounds "of Good and Wholesome Bread" from each 100 pounds of flour delivered him. Chribbs was to be credited with five dollars for every 196 pounds of bread baked. See also Williams to Conner, 24 April, 1801; Williams to Ormsby, 10 May, 1801, in *ibid.*

⁸⁰ Williams to Hamtramck, 25 April, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁸¹ Report of Provisions on Hand at Wilkinson Ville on the 1st April, 1801. This report was made to Colonel Strong. Report of Provisions at the Post of Wilkinson Ville on the 1st July, 1801. Two reports bear this latter date and differ somewhat in the figures presented. The most complete one has been used. Williams Papers.

Report of Provisions at Wilkinsonville, 1 July, 1801

On hand, 1 June, 1801:

Rations:	Salt Meat	Fresh Beef	Flour	Whiskey	Soap	Candles	Salt
	39,456½	1,700	246,873½	247,666	344,398½	307,082	68,250

Received since:

	12,790	53,134	203,072
Totals:	39,456½	14,490	300,010½	450,738	344,398½	307,082	68,250

Issued and Expended:

	19,353	13,353	33,045	38,217	32,394	34,194	15,000
--	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

On hand, 1 July, 1801:

	20,103½	1,137	266,965½	412,521	312,004½	272,888	53,250
--	---------	-------	----------	---------	----------	---------	--------

As mentioned above, information is lacking as to the type of installations constructed at Wilkinsonville. The fortifications were, however, mounted with brass six-pounder cannon.⁸² By mid-March the construction was evidently well advanced. At this time the place was visited by a tornado and partially destroyed; one soldier was killed and a number wounded, several seriously.⁸³ In March, 1801 there was established at the post a general paymaster whose jurisdiction extended as far as Fort Pickering (now Memphis, Tennessee).⁸⁴ Plans were also made for the establishment of an officer's training school at the Cantonment, with instruction to be provided "in the necessary sciences," this being thought likely to "promote the interest of the service." Considerable quantities of supplies and

⁸² General Orders, Headquarters, Pittsburgh, 25 February, 1 March, 1801, Wilkinson Order Book, 289-291.

⁸³ Lt. Ferdinand L. Claiborne to, 14 March, 1801 as printed in *Country Gazette of the United States and Daily Advertiser*, 9 May, 1801. See also Frankfort (Kentucky) *The Palladium*, 21 April, 1801; Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 1 May, 1801, in War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W323. In addition to the military casualties, the death of one woman and the injury of several others is mentioned. The presence of women in the camp is probably explained in that the laundry system of that period provided for four women laundresses to each company. It is not likely that officers' wives and families were at the Cantonment. General Orders, Headquarters, Pittsburgh, 27 June, 1801, in Wilkinson Order Book, 339.

⁸⁴ General Orders, Washington, 18 March, 1801, in Wilkinson Order Book, 313; Secretary of War to Paymaster General, 12 June, 1801, in Military Book, 1800-1803, 85; Stations of the Several Regimental Paymasters, 7 August, 1801, in Order Book, 1800-1805, 116.

⁸⁵ Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 8 April, 1801, in War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W322; same to same, 5 June, 1801, in *ibid.*, W325.

equipment were sent to the post in May.⁸⁶ A number of boats were also stationed at the Cantonment at this time, these probably being the same as those in which the troops had been moved to the post.⁸⁷

Due to lack of detailed information it is difficult to ascertain at given times the number of men and the names of the military organizations at the Cantonment. The bulk of the troops stationed there during the spring and summer of 1801 belonged to the Second Regiment of Infantry. But, some troops from the Fourth Regiment were also present, at least in mid-summer. In addition, some reference is made to Third Regiment personnel.⁸⁸ There were also smaller detachments of artillerists and engineers, a full military band, and quartermaster personnel.⁸⁹ The maximum strength at the post was reached at the end of July, 1801 when eleven companies of infantry and a company and a detachment of artillery were listed on the payroll.⁹⁰ In addition to military personnel, certain civilian personnel were attached to the post. The presence of women laundresses has been explained above. Their number at full strength would have been at least forty. Present also were civilians attached to the post

⁸⁶ General Orders, Headquarters, Pittsburgh, 8 May, 1800, Wilkinson Order Book, 325. Items mentioned are lances, swords, gun worms, cartridge boxes, screwdrivers, brushes and picks, bayonet scabbards, gun slings, and knapsacks.

⁸⁷ Governor William C. C. Claiborne to Secretary of War, 2 August, 1801, War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, C 34.

⁸⁸ General Orders, Wilkinsonville, 29 July, 30 July, 1801, in Wilkinson Order Book, 344, 346.

⁸⁹ General Orders, Wilkinsonville, 29, 30, 31 July, 1801, in Wilkinson Order Book, 343 ff. The band is mentioned as the General's pride and was said to have cost "much time, trouble and expense". Two "chief musicians" and 16 "musicians" are mentioned. Daily band practice was ordered by the General. General Orders, Wilkinsonville, 30 July, 1801, Wilkinson Order Book, 345; "Return of Clothing due the Army of the United States for the Year 1801", in Order Book, 1800-1805, 110-117, dated 7 August, 1801.

⁹⁰ "Abstract of pay due to the 2nd. Regt. of Infantry [and] one Company & a Detachment of the 2 Regt. Arll. [sic] & Engrs. at Wilkinson Ville", 2 August, 1801, in Wilkinson Papers, Chicago Historical Society. It should be pointed out that no mention is made here of units other than the Second Regiment of Infantry and the Second Regiment of Artillery and Engineers. This does not preclude the presence on temporary status of other troops at the post. The total payroll at Wilkinsonville at this time was \$12,821.06. If 70 men be counted for each company (this figure includes non-commissioned personnel, musicians, and privates, but not commissioned officers), the total strength at Wilkinsonville at that time may be roughly computed at some 900 men. For strength of companies at the post, see "Return of Clothing due the Army of the United States for the Year 1801", in Order Book, 1800-1805, 110-117, dated 7 August, 1801. This document, which undoubtedly refers to an earlier date than the payroll mentioned above, lists only eight companies of infantry as being present at the post. Each company enrolled about 64 privates, four non-commissioned officers, and two musicians.

in connection with the collection of tariff duties, for Wilkinsonville had replaced Fort Massac as the port of entry on the lower Ohio.⁹¹

No description of the Cantonment and its installations has been found. The report of the tornado, mentioned above, refers to the quartermaster's camp as being located on the southwest quarter of the post and adjacent to the barracks for the troops. A parade ground of some size must have been present, for it afforded room for a general review of all personnel. The river front provided a good harbor for boats.⁹²

Wilkinson's visit to the Cantonment in 1801 was incident to his journey into the south to treat with the Creeks.⁹³ Leaving Pittsburgh on 10 July, the General arrived at the Cantonment eighteen days later.⁹⁴ His stay there seems not to have extended much beyond the second day of August.⁹⁵ During the General's presence the Cantonment was actually general headquarters for the west, though Colonel Strong was technically continued in command of the post.⁹⁶

Wilkinson found the Cantonment personnel suffering from an epidemic of fever and dysentery. Such epidemics were not uncommon in the western posts at that time,⁹⁷ and officers were known to have resigned rather than accept an assignment to these posts.

⁹¹ Perrin du Lac writes: "Il est aujord' hui le séjour des employés de la douane et le seul sur l'Ohio qui ait conservé une garrison, destinée plutôt à surveiller l'entrée des bateaux qu'à exercer des fonctions militaires." *Voyage dans L'Amérique* (Paris, 1805), 161-162. Fort Massac was completely evacuated in May, 1801. See Williams to Adams, 15 January, 1801; Williams to Conner, 10, 24 April, 1801; Williams to Ormsby, 10 May, 1801. Williams Papers. Williams says the installations at Massac were put in possession of Indians and the white inhabitants "sent off".

⁹² Claiborne to, 14 March, 1801, in *loc. cit.*

⁹³ Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 26 June, 1801, War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W 327. In 1801, Jefferson's government undertook to negotiate a treaty with the Creeks and other tribes relative to securing their permission for the construction of the projected road from Natchez to Nashville. Wilkinson was chosen to head the American delegation. See below.

⁹⁴ Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 July, 1801, in War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W 329; Isaac Craig to Secretary of War, 10 July, 1801, in *ibid.*, W 330; same to same, 2 August, 1801, in *ibid.*, W 331; *Country Gazette of the United States*, 24 July, 1801; Conner to Williams, 6 July, 1801, Williams Papers.

⁹⁵ This is the last date mentioned in orders issued at the post by the General. Wilkinson Order Book, 343-352. On 10 August, Wilkinson was at Nashville. Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 August, 1801, in War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W 331.

⁹⁶ General Orders, Wilkinsonville, 29 July, 1801, in Wilkinson Order Book, 343.

⁹⁷ Writing from Chickasaw Bluffs (present Memphis) on July 22, 1799, Captain Zebulon Pike states: "Our men is very sickly & no medicine. . . ." Pike to Commanding Officer, Loftus Heights, Mississippi, in Letters Received, Fort Stoddard, April-November, 1799, 34.

The traveller Sealsfield says that the troops at Massac suffered much "from swamps in the rear of the fort."⁹⁸ At Fort Adams near Natchez the troops were regularly moved to higher ground during the summer months. An order states: "Zealous exertions are to be made on the works of the Fort before the sickly season commences, when the mass of the troops must be removed as heretofore."⁹⁹ Wilkinson, who had studied medicine early in life, describes the epidemic of 1801 as being general among the civilian population of Western Tennessee. "I found the Country below this [Nashville], toward the Ohio much more sickly than the Cantonement—for more than one hundred miles I did not enter a House where the first object was not Disease of the Bilious and intermittent character."¹⁰⁰

Wilkinson took an active interest in the matter of the health of his troops and did what he could to improve bad conditions at the posts. One of his orders reads:

A hardy, faithful, gallant, soldier, far removed from his natural friends and Connections, languishing on a sick bed under a parching fever has no where to look for Consolation for comfort or relief, but to his Officer and his surgeon, can a more interesting or affecting Spectacle present to the human mind—surely none—and the man who under such Circumstances can with indifference turn from or treat with neglect, a comrade of honor and misfortune who looks up to him for Support, is ready to shed the last drop of blood in his defence and to die by his side in the field of battle, must be a monster in feeling and in principle; the General sincerely hopes, no such Character will ever present under his command, should he be disappointed he pledges himself that the connection shall be a short one.¹⁰¹

However, medical science of the day was, under the best of conditions, inadequate to solve the problems faced. It was commonly believed then, as was the case long afterward, that summer epidemics were caused by polluted air, and there were standing orders prohibiting the troops from sleeping in the "open air exposed either to the dews or the sun" on the grounds that "such exposition in this Climate will infallibly produce disease."¹⁰² The General's famous

⁹⁸ Charles Sealsfield, *The Americans as they Are: described in a Tour through the Valley of the Mississippi*, London, 1828, 77.

⁹⁹ General Orders, Fort Adams, 30 March, 1802, Wilkinson Order Book, 384.

¹⁰⁰ Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 August, 1801, Wilkinson Papers.

¹⁰¹ General Orders, "Western Army near Natchez," 3 October, 1798, in Wilkinson Order Book, 151.

¹⁰² General Orders, Headquarters, Camp near Massac, 9 August, 1798, in General Orders, General James Wilkinson, 1797-1808, 127-128. This order book is now in the Library of Congress. Future references to this source will be designated by the initials "L. C." to distinguish these materials from references made to the Wilkinson Order Book in the National Archives.

haircropping order was partially justified from the standpoint of health.¹⁰³ Sanitary rules about the camps were evidently few and but loosely enforced.¹⁰⁴ The medical service was but poorly equipped and organized. In 1799 a depot for medical supplies was established at Fort Massac and this was probably removed to Wilkinsonville in 1801.¹⁰⁵ These supplies, however, were inadequate and the Quartermaster General was severely criticized for failure to provide the things needed for the frontier posts.¹⁰⁶ At this time leading medical men such as Dr. Benjamin Rush were requested to submit suggestions as to the "kinds and proportions of medicines necessary for each post" as well as recommendations for the medical personnel and surgical instruments needed.¹⁰⁷ Whether as a result of these recommendations or for other reasons the health of the troops seems to have improved after 1802.

Curiously enough, the military authorities at Massac seem finally to have stumbled upon one cause of the trouble and to have removed it. Thomas Ashe relates what had happened at Massac in regard to the draining of certain ponds to the rear of the fort, which had commonly received flood waters and had retained them "till exhausted by evaporation, a gradual process effected by the action of the burning sun" during which the water became stagnated or was "drawn into the atmosphere in a state sufficient to impregnate it with foetid smells and fatal poisons." One of the officers ordered these ponds drained so that the next flood passed on through, cleansing the area. The result according to Ashe, was that "the vernal fever was suppressed, the summer flux was gone, and the

¹⁰³ "For the accomodation, comfort, and health, of the troops, their hair is to be cropped without exception, and the General will give the example." General Orders, Pittsburgh, 29 April, 1801, in Wilkinson Order Book, (L.C.), unnumbered pages. See also, General Orders, Headquarters Wilkinsonville, 29 July, 1801, Wilkinson Order Book, 344. This order was fiercely resented by some of the older officers who were reluctant to cut their long hair. One famous court martial case grew out of it—the court martial of Lt. Col. Thomas Butler of the 4th Regiment of Infantry.

¹⁰⁴ One order reads: "No person is permitted to ease themselves within the limits of the Camp, but over the Gaults [*sic*], unless in case of sickness and then the excrements are to be immediately removed." General Orders, Headquarters, Loftus Heights, Mississippi, 9 October, 1798, in Wilkinson Order Book, 155.

¹⁰⁵ Isaac Craig, Deputy Quartermaster General, to General Wilkinson, 23 May, 1799, in Commanding Officer, Fort Stoddard, Letters Received, April to November, 1799, 3-4.

¹⁰⁶ Secretary of War to Quartermaster General, 12 June, 1801, in Order Book, 1800-1805, 92.

¹⁰⁷ See Secretary of War to Dr. Rush, 28 April, 1801, in Military Book, 1800-1803, 115-116; *id.* to Israel Whelen, 17 February, 1802, *ibid.*, 264. Replies to these requests have not been found, but such were made. See Secretary of War to Whelen, 27 March, 1802, *ibid.*, 173-175.

autumnal vomit and hoemorrhage [sic] entirely disappeared." He adds, however, that the men still suffered from "intermittents, pleur-asies, and a species of slow disease which consumes the body, extinguishes the natural heat of the blood, [and] changes the complexion into a livid pale."¹⁰⁸

Almost from the first, complaints had been made of the inadequacy of medical supplies at the Cantonment.¹⁰⁹ By late April Colonel Strong reported sickness among the troops and requested additional medicine and hospital supplies.¹¹⁰ By June the sickness had so increased that the War Department presumably became concerned over newspaper criticism of the losses of personnel. The decision for the removal of the troops, however, has another interpretation. Thomas Jefferson was now President of the United States and the new administration undoubtedly had questions about the Cantonment and the presence of Wilkinson's forces there. Indeed, the concern of the new Secretary of War for the health of the troops was merely an excuse for the abandonment of the Cantonment. At the same time there were considerations for the removal of Wilkinson from his command. Orders were therefore issued that the troops be removed to the Tennessee uplands, leaving only a small contingent at the Cantonment to guard the property to be left there.¹¹¹ There is no hint of Wilkinson's reaction to this change of affairs. That it was counter to his own schemes is evident enough. However, he was left in command and was thus able to continue his career in the west. At this time the government was planning the construction of a road from Natchez to Nashville and

¹⁰⁸ Thomas Ashe, *Travels in America Performed in 1806*, London, 1806, 279-280. Ashe said that only twenty men had died at Massac during the three years previous to his visit. *Ibid.*, 279.

¹⁰⁹ Wilkinson to Secretary of War, Pittsburgh, 13 Feb., 1801, in War Office, Letters Received, W 319.

¹¹⁰ Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 4 June, 1801, in *ibid.*, W 325. Here Wilkinson referred to a letter written by Strong on 25 April. On 24 April Williams reported that as many as three and four men were dying daily at the Cantonment. He identified the disease as dysentery and opined that the place would "be unavoidably Sickly owing to the number of Ponds &c that encircles its environs..." Williams to Conner, 24 April, 1801, Williams Papers.

¹¹¹ Writing on 11 June the Secretary referred to an account of the sickness as printed in a Cincinnati newspaper and expressed the opinion that continuing the troops there "unless some important public advantage might result from such occupancy" might be considered "as sporting with men's lives". Secretary of War to Wilkinson, 11 June, 1801, in *Military Book*, 1800-1803, 83-84. The same letter may be found in the Wilkinson Papers, Chicago Historical Society. Cox states that only Burr's intercession saved Wilkinson from being removed from the army. "James Wilkinson", in *loc. cit.*, 224. Ormsby anticipated the evacuation as early as 7 July, when he wrote Williams making provision for sending surplus stores to Natchez. Ormsby to Williams, Williams Papers.

it was decided to employ Strong's troops on this project.¹¹² Before this construction could take place, however, the Indians in that area would have to be pacified. Wilkinson, as has been pointed out above, was chosen to conduct these negotiations.¹¹³ In the meantime the Secretary of War was insistent that the Cantonment be evacuated as soon as possible.¹¹⁴

Upon Wilkinson's arrival at the post at the end of July, various measures were taken for the immediate relief of the sick pending their removal up the Tennessee river.¹¹⁵ On 1 August orders were issued for the evacuation.¹¹⁶ Somewhat later the Cantonment was evacuated except for a small guard detachment; the troops were moved up the Tennessee River; in the meantime, Wilkinson and the commissioners began negotiations with the Chickasaw and Creeks for permission to build the road. It was at this time that Colonel Strong died.¹¹⁷ The number of men who died at the Cantonment will probably never be known.¹¹⁸

¹¹² Secretary of War to Wilkinson, 11 June, 1801, in *loc. cit.*

¹¹³ On the subject of the Natchez-Nashville Pike, see Secretary of War to Wilkinson, 17 July, 1801, in Military Book, 1800-1803, 95; Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 3 July, 1801, in War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W 320; Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 August, 1801, Wilkinson Papers, Chicago Historical Society; Secretary of War to Lt. Col. Thomas Butler, 26 February, 1802, in Military Book, 1800-1803, 271-272. The road planned was to be 20 feet wide with bridges over streams and causeways over swamps and marshes. Rewards were to be offered for robbers and highwaymen. Military labor was to be used in the construction, the troops to be given extra pay and allowances for this work. Secretary of War to Butler, 16 April, 1802, in *ibid.*, 192-193; Secretary of War to Archibald Roane, 18 July, 1803, *ibid.*, 513-514.

¹¹⁴ Secretary of War to Wilkinson, 12 June, 1801, in Military Book, 1800-1803, 84. On 19 June, Wilkinson began plans for the removal of the troops. Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 19 June, 1801, in War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W 326.

¹¹⁵ General Orders, Wilkinsonville, 31 July, 1801, Wilkinson Order Book, 348; *ibid.*, 2 August, 1801, 350. A number of the sick were discharged as unfit for duty.

¹¹⁶ General Orders, Wilkinsonville, 1, 2, August, 1801, in Wilkinson Order Book, 349, 350. On 30 July, Williams was ordered to ration Col. Butler's Fourth Regiment personnel for ten days (later 20 days) provisions. Wilkinson to Williams, 30 July, 1801. On the following day he was ordered to make arrangements to issue 80 rations daily at Fort Vincennes. Same to same, 31 July, 1801. On 23 August, Williams sent considerable quantities of provisions to the mouth of the Tennessee, including 20 barrels salt pork, 90 barrels flour, and 12 barrels whiskey. This date probably corresponds to that of the movement of the main body of the troops. Invoice of Provisions Sent to the Mouth of the Tennessee, 23 August, 1801, Williams Papers.

¹¹⁷ Strong's death was reported by Wilkinson as having taken place on 19 August. Whether Strong died at the Cantonment or elsewhere is not clear from the documents. Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 8 September, 1801, in War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W 334. An inventory of Strong's personal belongings is referred to in Major J. H. Buell to Secretary of War, 20 September, 1801, in *ibid.*, B 20. In a letter dated 28 September, Wilkinson refers to the convalescing troops "near Cumberland,"

The history of the Cantonment after 1801 will be given briefly. During the winter of 1801-1802 some troops were stationed there.¹¹⁹ The following spring supernumeraries at Wilkinsonville and other posts in the west were ordered discharged.¹²⁰ It seems evident that Fort Massac was reoccupied at this time.¹²¹ Wilkinsonville was still on the rations list at this time, however,¹²² but was removed when contracts were made for 1802-1803.¹²³ Wilkinson was at the Cantonment in March, 1802 and evidently directed some repairs for the defense of the station. Additional artillerymen were also sent there at this time.¹²⁴ At the same time the Secretary of War was considering building a new post on the Mississippi either below or above the mouth of the Ohio, the same to be a "permanent Post in a situation well calculated for a settlement and

this evidently referring to Strong's command. Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 28 September, 1801, in *ibid.*, W 335. Williams closed his affairs at the Cantonment on 9 October, 1801, turning over his supplies to Charles Wilkins. Receipt of Charles Wilkins, Wilkinsonville, 9 October, 1801, Williams Papers.

¹¹⁸ Perrin's statement that "200 to 400 graves mark the spot where citizens and soldiers found burial" is undocumented. Perrin, *History*, 587. More dependable is a recent affidavit of an early settler of the vicinity where the Cantonment stood, who recalled as many as seventy graves. No trace of graves now remains. Sworn statement of Sarah Short, 30 March, 1929, in Moyers, "Some Early Americans" (reprint in Mounds, Ill., *Independent*, 16 March, 1934).

¹¹⁹ Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 13 October, 1801, in War Office, Letters Received, 1800-1802, W 335. Somewhat later, reference is made to the delivery to the commandant at Wilkinsonville of three Indians accused of murder. *The Guardian of Freedom*, 13 November, 11 December, 1801.

¹²⁰ Secretary of War to Major T. H. Cushing, 29 March, 1802, in Military Book, 1800-1802, 176. This was in accordance with the general reduction in the Armed Forces voted by Congress in March. Secretary of War to I. I. V. Rivardi and others, 1 April, 1802, in *ibid.*, 179-180.

¹²¹ A "military agent" was named for that post in 1802. Secretary of War to William Linnard, 5 May, 1802, in *ibid.*, 202-204; Circular of Instructions to Military Agents, 6 May, 1802, *ibid.*, 206-207. At this time also Lt. Col. T. H. Cushing sent in a report on the subject of rearrangement of the troops in the west. Massac is again listed as a post, with the recommendation that one company be posted there. Certain companies of the 2nd. and 3rd. Regiments of Infantry were to go to Fort Adams and Mobile. Document B, referred to in Cushing to Secretary of War, 18 March, 1802, in *ibid.*, 166-168.

¹²² War Department Notice, 20 April, 1801, in Military Book, 1800-1803, 103.

¹²³ Massac now resumed its place on the ration lists. Secretary of War to I. Meigs, 9 August, 1802, in *ibid.*, 343; Call for Bids for Provisions for Year 1802-1803, in Military Book, 1800-1803, 305. The same is true for 1803-1804, *ibid.*, 473.

¹²⁴ General Orders, Headquarters, Wilkinsonville, 12 March, 1802, in Wilkinson Order Book, 378-379. In the autumn of 1802 reference is made to the possible use of the facilities at Wilkinsonville for the storage of the tools then being returned from the construction of the Nashville-Natchez Pike. Secretary of War to George Salmon, 27 September, 1802, in Military Book, 1800-1803, 294.

ultimately for a place of business, where the Military may have the command of the Mississippi & Ohio Both."¹²⁵ The Cantonment is barely referred to in 1803 as a probable stopping place for a company then on its way to Illinois,¹²⁶ but no troops are listed as posted there in the list of posts and their complements.¹²⁷ Early in 1805 government property at Wilkinsonville was offered for sale and the buildings were thrown open to civilian occupancy.¹²⁸ Not even the purchase of Louisiana and its occupation in 1803 revived the Cantonment. Such preparations as were made for occupying Louisiana called for strengthening the troops in the upper Illinois posts and at Natchez and Fort Adams.¹²⁹

The site of the Cantonment continued, however, to be a stopping place for troops and civilians for some time after the army ceased to occupy it. By 1806 there were some twenty families in the general vicinity of Fort Massac, who, according to Ashe, furnished "corn, poultry, and hogs, and at a much dearer rate than I have yet heard of on the river banks . . ."¹³⁰ In 1807 a Cherokee town was located on the site of Wilkinsonville, that consisted of about twelve families.¹³¹ By this time, however, the buildings had been destroyed, evidently by fire, which had occurred, according to Cum- ing, in 1805.¹³² The Forsyth Map of 1812 does not mention the site, but it is mentioned on Carey and Warner's map of Tennessee

¹²⁵ Secretary of War to Captain Bissell, 6 July, 1802, in *Military Book*, 1800-1803, 235-237. This project was still under consideration in 1803. Secretary of War to Thomas H. Cushing, 9 March, 1803, in *ibid.*, 385.

¹²⁶ Secretary of War to Mathew Lyon, 9 March, 1803, in *Military Book*, 1800-1803, 432.

¹²⁷ "List of Posts & number of Compy's at Each Posts" (*sic*), Inclosure to Secretary of War to William Irvine, 7 March, 1803, in *ibid.*, 377.

¹²⁸ Secretary of War to Commanding Officer at Fort Massac, 18 February, 1805, in Moyer Notes, Southern Illinois Historical Society; same to same, 25 March, in *ibid.* The sale of cordage and sails is referred to here. Persons occupying the buildings were to repair them and to refrain from selling liquor to the Indians. The Louisiana Purchase in 1803 had of course rendered the post useless for military purposes.

¹²⁹ Secretary of War to Thomas Wilson, 3 November, 1803, *Order Book*, 1800-1805, 173; same to L. A. Seitz, 31 October, 1803, *ibid.*, 173-174; same to General Jackson, 31 October, 1803 in *Military Book*, 1800-1803, 555-556; same to Nathaniel Armstrong, 31 October, 1803, *ibid.*, 554-555.

¹³⁰ Ashe, *Travels*, 280.

¹³¹ Christian Schultz, *Travels on an Inland Voyage through the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee*, 2 vols. New York, 1810, II, 3-4. Schultz's visit was in the year 1807. See also "A Map of the Ohio River and part of the Mississippi, Containing the Route from Pittsburgh to St. Louis and the Mines", *ibid.*

¹³² Fortescue Cuming, *Sketches of a Tour to the Western Country* Pittsburgh, 1810, 252-253. Cuming blames the Indians for the destruction of the buildings.

published in 1816.¹³³ In 1819, however, the site was vacant, according to Dana.¹³⁴ By 1821 the spot was certainly deserted except for scattered farm houses in the general vicinity.¹³⁵ After this time there seems to have been nothing except farm dwellings on or near the site.¹³⁶ For many years, however, the name was still living as "Wilkinson's Landing," though "Cedar Bluffs" was more commonly used.¹³⁷ When Thwaites visited the site in 1897 it was already long forgotten by the farm population.¹³⁸

NORMAN W. CALDWELL

Southern Illinois University

¹³³ "Survey of the Countries South West of Lake Huron by Thos. Forsyth done at St. Louis the 20 Decr. 1812 and brought in by General Clark, copy from the original in possession of William Tatham by T. Stephenson, March 18, 1813". A copy of the original Carey and Warner Map may be found in the Illinois Historical Survey at Urbana. See also Map of Illinois, 1818, by John Melish, Tucker Collection, Illinois State Museum. From Cairo the road went north eastward through Wilkinsons-ville to Fort Massac, and from thence across the Ohio to Salem Kentucky.

¹³⁴ E. Dana, *Geographical Sketches on the Western Country designed for Emigrants and Settlers*, Cincinnati, 1819, 155. This does not agree with Gilleland, however, who still refers to a village which "has somewhat declined". J. C. Gilleland, *The Ohio and Mississippi Pilot, Consisting of a Chart of those Rivers, etc.*, Pittsburgh, 1820, 118.

¹³⁵ "Plate Ohio River—No. 19, Reconnaissance of the Mississippi & Ohio Rivers, 1821" prepared by Captain H. Young and others of the Topographical Engineers. Cumings' *Western Navigator* indicates at this time that the place was entirely vacant and "is noticed merely as a distinguishing point". Samuel Cumings, *The Western Navigator Containing Directions for the Navigation of the Ohio and Mississippi, etc.*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1822, II, 32. Beck also says the site was deserted. Lewis C. Beck, *A Gazetteer of the States of Illinois and Missouri*, Albany, 1828, 164. He no longer lists it on the map. It is, however, still listed on Carez's Map of 1825. J. Carez, *Carte Géographique, Statistique et Historique de l'Illinois*, Paris, 1825.

¹³⁶ Edmund Flagg, *The Far West: or a Tour Beyond the Mountains*, New York, 1838, 47.

¹³⁷ Plate 50, Map of the Ohio River, made under the Direction of Major W. E. Merrill, Corps of Engineers, 1867-1868.

¹³⁸ Reuben Gold Thwaites, *Afloat on the Ohio*, New York, 1900, 291. Thwaites himself erroneously dates the Cantonment from the War of 1812. The site, now known as Metcalf's Landing in Section 2, Township 15, Range 2, East of the 3rd. Principal Meridian, has been proposed as a state park, but this proposal did not receive favorable consideration. Manuscript Plat of Site by William Nelson Moyers in possession of Southern Illinois Historical Society; Resolution of Egyptian Chapter, D.A.R., at Quincy, Illinois, 17 March, 1932; "Proposed Park—Ft. Wilkinson Ville", in Report of George H. Luker, Superintendent of Parks, and David Abbott, Landscape Architect, to Director F. Lynden Smith, 9 November, 1937; Luker to Mrs. Grace Cabot Toler, 9 November, 1937, all in *ibid.*

The Cartography of the Mississippi

II. La Salle and the Mississippi

Before analyzing the map of 1684, we shall study La Salle's geographical conceptions of the Mississippi Valley, which are set forth in a letter written from Michilimackinac in October, 1682, after his return from the sea, and in a fragment of a letter written at Fort St. Louis (Starved Rock) in March, 1683. We shall then try to ascertain what his conceptions were—or what he said they were—after his return to France in 1684. In this connection we must examine what is the latitude of the mouth of the Mississippi, that is, the latitude which he took in 1682, and the change which it underwent after the expedition had reached Petit Goave, on Santo Domingo Island. Thirdly we shall treat briefly of the authors of two maps which embodied La Salle's geographical conceptions, Franquelin and Minet.

In the letter of October 1682, La Salle says that he had descended the Mississippi to the sea, to latitude 27° , but that it is impossible to send any relation or map this year, for on returning from the Gulf, he had been so ill that, even now, after four months, he is scarcely able to write a letter and he cannot delay the departure of the canoe if he wanted his mail to arrive at Quebec before the ships leave for France. He is sending a copy of the *procès-verbaux*; what took place during the voyage to the sea has been narrated at length in the letter of Tonti, and in another letter which La Salle wrote to Father Hippolyte Lefebvre, a copy of which he is sending to his correspondent. "If Reverend Father Zénobe Membré, a Recollect, goes to France this year, he will be able to give you an account, for he has been with me constantly; if he does not go to France, I have asked him to write to you."¹

He then goes on to speak of his trading, and is thus led to describe the Mississippi:

Two leagues from its mouth, it is no wider than the Loire, and an army could not, except with great difficulty, come on land, because of the thickness of canebrakes; so that with a small force it is possible to defend the riches of the fertile country on the banks of this river [fleuve]. It would

¹ Margry, 2: 288 ff.

also be easy to defend the seven or eight rivers, as large as the Mississippi, which empty into it; five of these rivers come from New Biscay and from New Mexico, where the Spaniards have found such rich mines. From the Mississippi, one could harrass and even completely ruin New Spain by arming the Indians who can easily be civilized, for they have temples, chiefs whom they obey, and a natural hatred for the Spaniards, because the latter made them slaves. The entrance to this country being so easy to defend, could also be effected by way of New France, should one lack the men to do it by sea. For *la louysiane* is only two days' journey from Lake Erie, which is contiguous to Lac Frontenac. This *Louysiane* is a large river [fleuve] with which the Colbert mingles its waters. By means of this *louysiane* one could have an easy communication between this colony and Canada.²

He will not speak of pearls nor of the various riches of the country, but he repeats that this colony is absolutely necessary for New France, "because the Colbert and the *louysiane* are both navigable, at least to barks, without any rapids or falls, and so we could communicate with the places where the Indians live who supply Canada with peltries." In virtue of his commission, he was authorized to build forts, and he has had one built near the present South Bend, Indiana. Now he wants "the concession of the Illinois River down to the mouth of the Ouabache, on the east side of the Colbert River, with ten leagues in depth on the west side of the Colbert," and he is asking that this tract of land be erected into a province. He is also asking the concession of the Arkansas River with ten leagues on both sides of the river; finally, a concession of six leagues front with as many in depth at the village of the Koroa, and another concession of unspecified extent at the mouth of the Mississippi. For the present, however, he would be satisfied with the fort at South Bend, the concession of the Illinois River, and the exclusive right to trade in these regions. He pledges himself not to trade in the country of Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and other lakes, where the Indians live who trade with Montreal. In fact, the South Bend concession is all that he needs, for he can trade with Canada by way of Lake Erie.

He is very anxious to have the Iroquois remain peaceful, because, in case of war, "I could only go to the Illinois country by way of Lake Huron and Lake Michigan, for the other route which I discovered north and south of Lake Erie would be too dangerous," owing to prowling Iroquois. He did not build a fort near the sea, because the distance is much too great; but the fort at South Bend will serve its purpose, and next year, he will build a fort near the

² *Ibid.*, 293.

sea. "If I had had enough men to build forts along the way, the establishment would be completed by now. All that is needed is the price of the passage of sixty men, twenty or thirty negroes, and two or three thousand *écus*' worth of merchandise." He promises that he will make a report next year, and will send maps and memoirs, "if I do not bring them myself."³

We did not wish to interrupt La Salle's letter with comments. That this letter was written at Michilimackinac appears from his reference to the numerous rapids between the post and Montreal. That it was written at the beginning of October is clear from what he says about his inability to write during four months, and also from other documents which testify to his presence at Michilimackinac at the beginning of October.⁴ That he wrote it in 1682 appears from his allusion to the completion of his discovery. The *procès-verbaux* of which he speaks are those made by La Métairie;⁵ Tonti's letter which he mentions is that of July 22, 1682;⁶ but the letter to Father Lefebvre seems to be lost. It should be noted that when Membre left for Lower Canada, La Salle did not know whether the Recollect would go to France that year; his instructions seem to have depended on what the missionary would find at Québec.

We merely call attention to the width of the Mississippi, the canebrakes on its banks, and its proximity to New Biscay and New Mexico, but we shall comment more at length on the new river which makes its appearance in this letter. This *louysiane* is nothing else than the Ohio, and from what La Salle says, he looked upon it as the main stream "with which the Colbert River mingles its waters." There is no possibility of misunderstanding, for he repeats the name *la louysiane* three times. He had already spoken of two rivers "que j'ay trouvées" and had described their course in previous letters. One of these two rivers was the Baudrane, which the Iroquois call the Ohio, and the Ottawa the Olighin-cipou,⁷ and the other river was the Ouabanchi-Aramoni.⁸ If there were still a doubt that in 1683 La Salle had descended this river, such a doubt would now be removed, for he says that his *louysiane* had neither rapids nor falls.

What routes La Salle had "discovered" south of Lake Erie is problematical, for although we know that in 1680, he walked along

³ *Ibid.*, 301.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 310.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 181 ff, and 186 ff.

⁶ Habig, 215 ff.

⁷ Margry, 2: 80.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 244.

the north shore of this lake,⁹ he did not seem to have traveled along the south shore.

He himself does not seem to have been very clear about the first concession for which he asks. The mouth of the Wabash must be that of the Ohio, unless in his earlier map he had made a distinction between the Wabash and the *Louysiane*. As for the fort at South Bend, which he seems to make the key of his system, at least temporarily, it was never built. Tonti had indeed left Michilimackinac in September, but finding no Indians at South Bend portage, he went to the Illinois country to spend the winter there;¹⁰ and when La Salle arrived at the portage in December and found the place deserted, he, too, went to the Illinois country, and built Fort St. Louis on Starved Rock during the first months of 1683.

It was probably after the completion of this fort that La Salle wrote his dissertation on the geography of the Illinois and the Mississippi. The two fragments of this dissertation, which I think were two parts of the same letter, are printed in Margry from the La Salle papers found among those of Bernou. The first fragment describes the voyage to the sea, but stops short at the Missouri, and the second fragment contains his ideas on the general geography of the Mississippi. We shall discuss them in order.

He begins by describing the Chicago portage and the Chicago River, which he says is not a practical route between the Illinois country and the lakes. It would be much easier to go overland from Fort St. Louis to Lake Michigan, using horses which they could get from western Indian tribes. These tribes are, to be sure, somewhat far inland, but with them "one can very easily communicate by way of the Missouri River which empties into the Colbert River. The Missouri may be the main tributary of the Colbert, for it is navigable for more than 400 leagues toward the west. Or, one may go by land; for the whole country between these tribes and the Colbert River is an open and vast plain through which horses can be brought to Fort St. Louis."

He then goes on to narrate the events of the voyage down the Chicago River, and comes back to the description of the Illinois River, which rises in a marsh, one and a half league from the River of the Miami (the St. Joseph River, at South Bend), and three leagues from the village of the Miami which they have now abandoned. He then speaks of the river as well as of the neighboring country, its fauna and flora, and minutely describes Fort St. Louis. "Two leagues

⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 63 f.

¹⁰ Margry, 1: 613.

below the fort and on the same side is the river which the Indians call Aramoni, a small but very swift river." He finally comes to the Mississippi.

The great river comes down from the southwest and flows toward the east-northeast. The mouth of the Illinois is distant from Percée Island by 39 degrees of longitude or thereabout, which means 107 degrees from La Rochelle, that is to say, almost as far west as Mexico. Then the river swings slowly toward the southwest . . . until it meets the Missouri which empties into the Colbert ten leagues below the Illinois River. The Missouri which comes from the west may be the main tributary of the Colbert. It is wide and deep; the volume of its water is very great; great rivers empty into it; a great number of nations dwell on its banks; and it passes through a beautiful country.¹¹

Until the Mississippi meets the Missouri, its waters are clear, but below they are troubled. The reason for this, he thinks, is that the bottom is muddy. Another peculiarity is that, although several rivers, some larger than the Mississippi, empty into it, it does not become wider.

How La Salle knew that there were horses in the Missouri country he does not say. All that he had seen was a single hoof of a horse which was shown to him by an Indian.¹² The Ouabanchi-Aramoni, instead of providing an easy communication between the Illinois country and Lake Erie and Fort Frontenac, turned out to be a "small but very swift river." Now, he was writing this in 1683, that is, one year after Peronel-Bernou had presented their map to Seignelay. When he wrote his letter of 1681, he simply invented this river, had never descended it, and all his geography of the Ohio valley was simply conjectural. Finally, we have the longitude of the mouth of the Illinois River. First of all, neither La Salle nor anybody else in his day could compute longitude, and in fact his measurements are all faulty. For instance, there is an error of five degrees between Percée and La Rochelle; and between Percée and the mouth of the Illinois River there is a difference of twenty-six degrees, not thirty-nine, which in all makes a difference of eighteen degrees. If his computation had been correct, he would have been somewhere in Central Kansas. What he says about the Missouri is true, though it was only a guess on his part. Its course from its headwaters to the mouth is nearly 3,000 miles, whereas the Mississippi from its source in Lake Itasca to the mouth of the Missouri is about 1,200 miles.

¹¹ Margry, 2: 180.

¹² *Ibid.*, 54.

The second fragment is by far the more important of the two. We have here the evolution of La Salle's thoughts and, in germ, all the elements of the course of the Mississippi found in the map of 1684. He begins as follows: "Chucagoa, which means in their language [Chickasaw or Cisca] 'great river' as Mississippi does in Ottawa and Mascicapi in Illinois, is the river [fleuve] which we call the St. Louis River. The Ohio, which is one of its tributaries, receives two other quite large rivers before emptying into the St. Louis River; these tributaries are the Agouassaké, a river in the north and the river of the Shawnee in the south."¹³ The St. Louis River is boldly marked on the map of 1684, where there is an "Ohio al[ia]s Mosopeleacipi al[ia]s Olighin." It empties into the St. Louis River; its other name, Mosopeleacipy, simply means the river of the Mosopelea, whose eight villages are said to be destroyed. The Agousaké is marked as a tributary of the Wabash, and there is no river of the Shawnee on the map. La Salle had evidently read, or better, he had with him, Garcilaso de la Vega's book as adapted by Richelet in 1670, and throughout the rest of his dissertation tries to reconcile the geography of this book with what he himself had seen and heard.

The Takahagane dwell on the northern bank of the Chucagoa, at about latitude 32°, while the Chickasaw are in the interior of the country, almost due south of the mouth of the Illinois River which empties into the Colbert River, that is to say, at about thirty-nine degrees west of Percée Island. At seventeen days' journey up the St. Louis River, estimating seven or eight leagues a day on the average, the route being toward the east-northeast or thereabouts, there is an island on which the Kaskins live. Few of these Indians are left, for the Iroquois have destroyed most of them and have forced the others to flee. The Tchalaké are on the northern bank of the same St. Louis River, at about 34 degrees north latitude. This river is much larger than the Colbert. I have not yet descended it.¹⁴

This last sentence shows that all the above information is from hearsay. The Takahagane are the Tacaogane on the map of 1684, and are marked at latitude 36°, instead of 32°. On the same map, the Chickasaw are said to be nine villages on the bank of the Rio del Espíritu Santo due south of the mouth of the Illinois River. The Kaskins are not shown on the map, but the Tchalaké—written Tchalaka—are on it at the same latitude as the Takahagane. With the exception of the Takahagane, the names of these two Indian tribes were known from the narrative of Garcilaso de la Vega,¹⁵ and one

¹³ *Ibid.*, 196.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 197.

¹⁵ P. Richelet, *Histoire de la conquête de la Floride ou Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans la découverte de ce Pays par Ferdinand de Soto*, 2 vols., Paris, 1670, 1: 266 ff, and 2: 73 ff.

wonders whether all this is not an invention, for since La Salle never descended the river, he could hardly have been speaking from experience. In March 1683, he tried to reconcile what he knew with what he read in Garcilaso de la Vega, and imagined that the Chucagoa was identical with the St. Louis River which he had not yet descended. This conviction so imposed itself on his mind that he thought the exploration of the Mississippi was but an episode in the search for the Chucagoa.

The Apalachites, a nation which inhabit English Florida, are not very far from some of the most easterly branches of the St. Louis River, for they are at war with the Tchalaké and the Cisca. The Apalachites, with the aid of the English, once burnt a village of the Cisca, the latter then left their former villages, which were much farther east than those whence they have come here. Although this river flows from east to west, it seems that it should empty into the Colbert River, for the Takahagane, who dwell on the banks of the Chucagoa, are so near the Colbert River that they are only three days' journey from the Mississippi, and we have seen some of them on our way down and up the river.¹⁶

The villages whence the Cisca came to Fort St. Louis were situated on the Misseouecipi, the easternmost tributary of the St. Louis River. This name Cisca and the name of the Apalaches are also in Garcilaso de la Vega.¹⁷ With regard to the Indians which La Salle mentions as having seen on his way down and up the Mississippi, the only one which we can be sure he saw were the Chickasaw, and there is no mention of any other tribe in contemporary accounts of the voyage until the expedition had reached the Arkansas.

We have here another instance of his speaking from hearsay. Since the Chucagoa flows from east to west, it must meet the Mississippi somewhere along its course. This is confirmed by what he says next: "I could not really say whether the two rivers meet." La Salle's error came from listening too readily to what he had heard, or from taking for granted what he had read in Garcilaso de la Vega. When he speaks from hearsay, he invents rivers, first the Baudrane, then the Ouabanchi-Aramoni, and finally the Louisiane; in this passage he takes for granted the account of the De Soto expedition as narrated in Richelet. So obsessed was he by the latter's account that he managed to find reasons supporting it; and he comes back again to this narrative, which he must have had at hand when he wrote his dissertation.

"Assuredly," he continues, "the relation of Ferdinand de Soto is

¹⁶ Margry 2: 197.

¹⁷ *Histoire de la conquête de la Floride*. 1: 141 ff, 220 f, and 2: 74 ff.

not a fairy tale." Why, there is the name of the river, Chucagoa;¹⁸ the names of all the nations who dwell on its banks; the great number of Indians at Mauvila, where De Soto waged such a bloody battle.¹⁹ There would be no sense, he goes on to say, in speaking of the great number of pirogues giving chase to the remnants of the retreating De Soto's army.²⁰ "The banks of the Mississippi were never more thickly populated than they are now, because nearly all that is not inhabited is almost constantly under water." Then there are the names of Indian tribes: the Quiqualthangi and the Anilco—two names taken from Garcilaso de la Vega²¹—are as unknown on the Colbert River as those of Korea, Natchez, Huma, etcetera are well known. There is also the "prodigious width of the Chucagoa,"²² whereas the Mississippi, even near the sea, is hardly wider than the Loire; and the time it took the remnants of De Soto's army to reach Mexico,²³ also tends to show that the Chucagoa is not the Mississippi.

"Furthermore, all the maps which place the mouth of the Colbert River very near Mexico are worthless." This statement is difficult to reconcile with the rest of this digression. A few lines earlier, La Salle had written: "The mouth of the Mississippi cannot be far from Mexico"; and a little below: "This is what makes me maintain that we were near Mexico, and consequently in a river other than the Chucagoa, whence it took the Spaniards so long to reach Mexico." The statement about the maps being worthless is probably an error on his part.

In the present case, he argues that the Colbert River—which in fact is the Mississippi—has its mouth facing east-southeast, and not due south; except the portion between "the river Escondido on the maps and Pánuco. The Escondido is assuredly the Mississippi." He goes on to say that this same portion of the coast is the only place which lies in latitude 27°, the latitude which he had observed at the mouth of the Mississippi. The rest of Florida, he remarks, is at latitude 30° at nearly every point.

There is, of course, another section of the coast where the mouth of the Mississippi might face east-southeast, namely,

¹⁸ "Cette ville [Chisca] est située proche un fleuve que les Indiens appellent *Chucagua*, le plus grand de tous ceux que nos gens ayent vû dans la Floride." *Ibid.*, 2: 74.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 2: 22 ff.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 2: 205 ff.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 2: 174 ff.

²² Near the sea the Chucagoa is fifteen leagues wide, "si bien qu'on ne decouvroit la terre de coté ny d'autre." *Ibid.*, 2: 215.

²³ *Ibid.*, 2: 221 ff.

the Florida peninsula. But this is out of the question, for the Colbert River flows steadily eastward, or at most southeastward, and there would be no room for it in the east-west width of this peninsula, since it runs to the southeast for at least 120 leagues, from latitude 30° to latitude 27°, at which point it empties into the sea. This would be impossible in the width of the Florida peninsula. Now this direction is precisely that followed by the Rio Escondido.²⁴

We touch here one of the fundamental errors of La Salle's conception. He had correctly observed the direction of the Mississippi, but was led astray by the maps of the time, which show no delta in the whole extent of the Gulf coast. However, nothing but such a delta would explain the east-southeast direction of the mouths of the Mississippi, and he would naturally locate his river on the Texas coast.

La Salle had a further argument, drawn from Garcilaso de la Vega, to show that he must have been in a different river than that explored by De Soto. The latter rode on horseback along the banks of the Chucagoa;²⁵ this, said La Salle, is impossible, for the banks of the Mississippi are full of canebrakes. Often, also, De Soto found it difficult to find landing places because of the height of the banks of the river,²⁶ whereas the banks of the Mississippi are everywhere low and often underwater.

Furthermore, the following reason makes me think that the Chucagoa is different from the Mississippi and flows parallel to it. No large river empties into the Mississippi from the east, whereas it receives very large rivers from the west. I have always surmised that there must be in the east another large river into which all these waters must empty. Indeed after one or two days' journey into the woods, all the creeks and rivers run eastward and not one toward the Mississippi.

La Salle must be speaking of the Mississippi below the Ohio. The latter is just as large a river as the Arkansas and the Red River, the only two other rivers flowing into the Mississippi below the Ohio which he saw. With regard to the observation that all the creeks and rivers flowed eastward, here, too, he is generalizing, his only recorded journey inland is his search for Prud'homme.

After we reached latitude 31°, all the Indians who go to the sea to make salt agreed in saying that the sea was situated to the east. Every morning we saw sea mists coming from the shore of the Bay du St. Esprit and from the sea coast lying northwest-southwest from [Rio] Escondido to [Rio or Costa] de Pescadores and the above mentioned bay.²⁷

²⁴ Margry, 2: 199.

²⁵ *Histoire de la conquête de la Floride*, 2: 102, and *passim*.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 2: 79.

²⁷ Margry, 2: 200.

The above latitude, 31° , is that which he took at the Taensa village; from here on, he thought he was in the Rio Escondido and that the Baye du St. Esprit was situated to the east. He then speaks of the tide in the Gulf of Mexico, and mentions that it makes itself felt as far as present-day Donaldsonville. This reference to tide and the fact that the manuscript is found today among Bernou's papers make me think that the letter was addressed to the latter.

I have made this digression about this river unintentionally. Although several Indians have told me that the Chucagoa empties into the Mississippi (which could be), we have not seen the confluence, because beyond the Arkansas village there is a great island or rather several islands measuring from sixty to eighty leagues long. We took the west channel on our way down, and as we have left all our baggage at the Arkansas, we had to return by the same way. It may be that the Chucagoa has its mouth in the other channel. The Mississippi would not get wider, for its bed does not change, although it receives, from the west, four other great rivers as large as the Chucagoa.²⁸

We have already discussed his reference to the "islands" of the Mississippi. Here we are given the reason why, after they missed the east channel on the way down, they missed it again on the return journey. On his journey to the sea, La Salle saw four rivers coming from the west. Three of them are below the Ohio, that is the Seignelay (Red), the Arkansas, and the Chepousse rivers. If the latter is the St. Francis River, it is difficult to see that its waters can make much difference to the course of the Mississippi.

All the above information is the latest development of La Salle's geographical conception of the course of the Mississippi and of its tributaries. This conception was elaborated in March 1683, that is, seven or eight months before he went to France. Here he soon realized that the Mississippi, or, as he thought, the Rio Escondido, had little chance to induce Seignelay to finance an expedition to that river by sea. Hence La Salle had to bring the Mississippi or one of its tributaries nearer to the mines of New Biscay.

In order to understand what follows, it is necessary to remember that plans for the conquest of New Spain had been formerly presented to the French government. I have discussed these plans elsewhere and have shown that, as early as 1682, Bernou thought of beginning a French colony "in Florida, at the mouth of the river called Rio Bravo," as a first step toward the conquest of New Biscay.²⁹

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 201.

²⁹ *Some La Salle Journeys*, Chicago, 1938, 70 ff.

When La Salle returned to Quebec at the end of October 1683, he learned that his discovery was thought to be useless,³⁰ and La Barre sent him to France.³¹ In this there was nothing unusual, for his commission had expired.³² While in France, he first tried to interest the merchants of Rochefort and La Rochelle in financing an expedition to the Mississippi by sea. Not succeeding in this, he approached others. "According to the unpublished journal of Minet, he tried to float a company that would enable him to go to the Gulf of Mexico, find the Colbert River by sea and then establish himself in the Taensa county; but seeing that the merchants of Paris and Rouen would not fall in with his project, he found men who presented him to Seignelay."³³ It was then that he gave an account of his discoveries to the king, who listened favorably to his proposition,³⁴ and the matter was referred to Seignelay. Since the latter was more interested in an expedition against New Biscay than in a colonization project on the Mississippi, La Salle tried to win him over by showing that one of the tributaries of the Mississippi flowed near New Biscay.

Pedro Ronquillo, the Spanish ambassador in England, wrote as follows to the Conde de Monclova, the viceroy of New Spain:

He [La Salle] found a great welcome with M. de Seignelay, to whom he presented a map marked with latitudes and longitudes that made his proposals plausible. On his word they believed in him and in his map. He made them believe what he wanted them to believe. He offered to build two forts on the banks at the mouth of the river, if they would equip him for this undertaking. By building these forts, he would prevent everyone from entering the river to take the treasures that were there.³⁵

Besides this map, there are four memoirs outlining his proposals; two of these memoirs are dated, while the date of the other two must be deduced from internal evidence.³⁶ Since they all contain the same thing, we need only extract from one of them La Salle's description of the Lower Mississippi.

What La Salle set out to do was to find "a port for the king's

³⁰ Louis XIV to La Barre, August 5, 1683, Margry, 2: 310.

³¹ La Barre to Dongan, June 15, 1684, *ibid.*, 346.

³² His letters-patent, good for five years, were dated May 12, 1678.

³³ M. de Villiers du Terrage, *L'expédition de Cavelier de la Salle dans le golfe du Mexique (1684-1687)*, Paris, 1931, 32.

³⁴ Tronson to Dollier, April 20, 1684, Margry, 2: 354.

³⁵ Ronquillo to Monclova, February 7, 1687, MID-AMERICA, 18 (1936): 121. Cf. Bernou to Renaudot, February 22, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497: 98.

³⁶ The two undated memoirs are in Margry 2: 359 ff, and in Margry, 3: 17 ff; the third is dated January, 1684, *ibid.*, 48 ff, and the fourth February 1684, *ibid.*, 63 ff.

vessels in the Gulf of Mexico."³⁷ The finding of a port was an afterthought, for neither in his commission nor in any other document, except in the journal of Cavelier,³⁸ is there any mention of such a project. In the second undated memoir, he speaks of building a fort sixty leagues above the mouth of the Colbert River and of subduing the Spaniards with an army composed of "more than 15,000 Indians." This fort will be most advantageously situated to seize the mines of New Spain at the first opportunity. He then proceeds to explain the position of the nearest province of New Spain with regard to his fort.

New Biscay, the northernmost province of Mexico, is situated between latitudes 25° and 27° 30'. To the north of this province are vast forests inhabited by people called Terliquimequi, whom the Spaniards know as "Indios Bravos" and "Indios de or di [sic] Guerra," because they have never been able to subdue them or force them to make peace. These Indians inhabit the land between New Biscay and the Seignelay River [fleuve], distant sometimes forty, sometimes fifty leagues from it. The same forests stretch to the east and to a part of Pánuco. New Biscay is separated from the latter province by a mountain range, which also separates it on the south from the province of Zacatecas, on the west from the province of Culiacán, and on the northwest from that of New Leon. There are only two or three mountain passes through which help could come from New Spain to New Biscay.³⁹

La Salle then deals with the possible objection that the Seignelay River may be much farther from New Biscay than is said in the memoir. To this objection he answered that the river empties into the Mississippi one hundred leagues to the west-northwest of the place where the Mississippi disembogues into the Gulf of Mexico, and "that the Seignelay River has been ascended more than sixty leagues toward the west."⁴⁰ This is false, for it is certain that no one had made this ascent. In the course of his argument the conquest of New Biscay becomes easier; all one has to do is to ascend the Rio Bravo [Rio Grande], "which is the same as the river which the Indians call Mississippi," whose discovery to the sea La Salle has just completed.⁴¹

This is still another geographical development. La Salle had formerly said that he was in the Rio Escondido; now he claims to have explored the Rio Bravo. At about this time, Bernou wrote as follows to Renaudot: "Villermont wrote to me that La Salle

³⁷ Margry 3: 17.

³⁸ *The Journal of Jean Cavelier*, Chicago, 1938, 131.

³⁹ Margry, 2: 361.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁴¹ Margry, 3: 55.

found, so he wrote, a river coming from the west, thirty days' journey long, which empties into the Mississippi forty or sixty leagues from the sea. If this river should be the Rio Bravo, it would give a very safe and very easy communication with New Leon, New Biscay and New Mexico."⁴² This is quite different from what Bernou had written in the relation officielle, where he said that the Rio Escondido—i.e. the Mississippi—emptied into sea "about thirty leagues from the Rio Bravo."⁴³ This was correct according to Bernou's map of 1682, where the mouth of this river appears at about 26 degrees of latitude, and since the mouth of the Mississippi was at latitude 27°, it follows that the Rio Bravo should be at the distance mentioned in the relation officielle. At this time, however, Bernou had not yet seen La Salle's map, where the only river coming from the west and emptying into the Mississippi forty or sixty leagues from the sea is the Seignelay. It is clear that La Salle took liberties with the geography of the Mississippi in order to deceive Seignelay, and that Seignelay was willing to believe anything he said. The minister apparently paid no attention to such alterations of names as the Seignelay, the Rio Escondido, and the Rio Bravo. In one place La Salle speaks of building a fort sixty leagues up the Mississippi; in another place he said that he had ascended the Seignelay sixty leagues, and in this place, he says that the "Rio Bravo" empties into the Mississippi "fifty or sixty leagues from the sea."

The question of the latitude of the mouth of the Mississippi should be treated here for two reasons. First, because it has been claimed that La Salle's main error was one of longitude, although in fact neither he nor anybody else at that time could compute longitude with any degree of accuracy.⁴⁴ Second, because we must find out what La Salle himself said with regard to the position of the mouth of the Mississippi. We must note once for all that La Salle never had any idea of the delta; when this feature appeared on a map, Joutel expresses wonder that it could be missed.⁴⁵

When La Salle entered the Gulf from Cabo San Antonio on his last expedition, he knew that he had to go as far as the latitude ob-

⁴² Bernou to Renaudot, February 23, 1684, Margry, 3: 76.

⁴³ MID-AMERICA, 22 (1940): 33.

⁴⁴ J. F. Steward, "La Salle a Victim of his Error in Longitude," *Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society for the 1910, 15 (1911): 129-136*. "Mais l'astrolabe était dérangé et il ne put ne aucune manière relever la longitude." R. Gaillard, *Louisiane*, Paris, 1947, 508. As though if La Salle's astrolabe had not been out of order, he could have taken the longitude.

⁴⁵ "Et sy ledit fleuve [Mississippi] se gette dans la mer a un cap aussy auancé que lauteur [Delisle] le marque il est a croire quon ne lauroit pas du manquer." ASH, 115-9: no. 12.

served in 1682, and that he must sail in a northwesterly direction. According to the maps which he had at that time, the whole coast was represented as a semi-circle whose northern latitude was thirty degrees, and in the west of this coast was marked a large bay—the Bahia del Espíritu Santo.

Before leaving Santo Domingo, the members of the expedition had talked to some filibusters who had gone to the northern coast, but none of them had made any mention of the delta. If they actually followed the route indicated on De Villiers' chart of the navigation of the expedition, they were nearest to the mouth of the Mississippi on December 27, 1684,⁴⁶ and if La Salle had steered some ten minutes of arc to the east, he would have stumbled on the mouth of the river.

In order to discover his actual location we must refer back to his earlier voyage. On his way to the Gulf in 1682, La Salle took the latitude at the Taensa village and found 31 degrees, that is, one degree lower than his true position.⁴⁷ When he reflected that he was only one degree from the sea, for according to his map the latitude of the northern coast of the Gulf was 30°, and that he had actually to travel eleven days before reaching the mouth of the Mississippi, he was frankly puzzled. In 1683, Bernou wrote in the relation officielle that La Salle, who always carried an astrolabe, had taken the "precise latitude" of the mouth of the Mississippi.⁴⁸ But what was this precise latitude? Tonti wrote from Michilimackinac: "We went below latitude 29° . . . He has kept the latitude of the mouth to himself."⁴⁹ From a fragment of La Salle's letter written in March 1683, we know that he took the latitude at 30° and at 28°, ⁵⁰ and it does not seem that, at this second latitude, he thought he was anywhere near the mouth of the river. "At about 27 degrees of latitude," he took possession of Louisiana,⁵¹ and on his return to Michilimackinac, in October 1682, he says in a letter to Paris: "I have gone down the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico, to latitude 27°."⁵²

In 1684, after his return to France, he told Tronson that he had found the mouth of the river at latitude 27°, on the same meridian as

⁴⁶ See the map in *L'expédition de Cavelier de la Salle*, between pp. 78-79.

⁴⁷ Kellogg, *Early Narratives of the Northwest*, 300; La Salle's letter of March 1683, Margry, 2: 199.

⁴⁸ MID-AMERICA, 22 (1940): 33.

⁴⁹ Tonti to . . . , July 22, 1682, Habig, 229.

⁵⁰ Margry, 2: 198.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 190, and 191.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 288.

Pánuco.⁵³ This was not a mistake on his part, for in 1687 Tronson wrote to Belmont as follows:

When you have time, make a copy of the map of western New France which you gave to M. de Denonville, and send it to us. You place the mouth of the Mississippi at latitude 18 [sic] and M. de la Salle placed it at latitude 27° on the map which he gave me. Although from the Illinois to the sea, the river is 600 leagues long, its mouth can nevertheless be at latitude 27°, if it makes as many turns as M. de la Salle marks. This is perhaps what led you into error.⁵⁴

On his return to France, Beaujeu, the captain of the *Joly*, wrote to Villermont, who in turn wrote to Bernou. In a letter to Renaudot, Bernou took Villermont to task, for Beaujeu had said that La Salle had not found the marks which he had left near the mouth of the Mississippi in 1682,⁵⁵ and had inscribed on the map which he gave to Seignelay. Bernou had seen a copy of this map, and "La Salle wrote to me, as you know, and as you shall see in my relation that these marks are up the river. Anyway La Salle found the river without any trouble and at the latitude which he had said."⁵⁶ What this latitude was we learn from another letter of Bernou to Renaudot.

La Salle, said Bernou, quoting Villermont, landed at latitude 28° 20' on a sand bank. The whole coast is a series of sand banks which Beaujeu followed on his return for 200 leagues without finding the end. Hence, Villermont concludes, La Salle's provisions will be exhausted before he finds his river. To this Bernou answers:

To argue in this manner, he must not have seen the map of M. de la Salle, nor his relation, nor La Salle himself, nor Father Membré. If he had seen any of these, Villermont would know that La Salle places the mouth of his river at 27 degrees and a few minutes of Latitude. This single fact answers twenty or thirty leagues to find the latitude of his river which he himself all Villermont's arguments . . . All that La Salle has to do is to go *south* twenty or thirty leagues to find the latitude of his river which he himself observed with an astrolabe. He cannot miss it, because the coast runs north-south.

As we shall see, Bernou supposed that La Salle landed, as he actually did, at latitude 28° 20', and since Bernou had this information from the map of La Salle, he clearly states that the mouth of the river lies in latitude 27°. There are no shallows along the coast, he continues; nobody knows this better than La Salle, who had sounded the Mississippi and had found five or six fathoms down

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 355.

⁵⁴ Tronson to Belmont, [May], 1687, no. 339.

⁵⁵ Journal of Joutel in Margry, 3: 161.

⁵⁶ Bernou to Renaudot, August 14, 1685, BN, Mss. fr. n. a, 7497: 245v.

to the sea; as for sand banks along the coast, if there had been any, La Salle would have mentioned them. Furthermore, Bernou is persuaded that there cannot be any, and among his reasons is the following: "No map or relation speaks of a false coast from Vera Cruz to Pánuco, nor even as far as the Rivière des Palmes. The latter is not far from the branch of the Mississippi, and La Salle marked it to the right [*i.e.*, south] of the river which he descended and which perhaps empties—or at least a part of it—into the Rivière des Palmes." On Franquelin's map of 1684, there is a "Rio de Palma[s]," but La Salle does not make the junction suggested by Bernou.

Why then, Bernou asks, did La Salle land at latitude 28° and not at latitude 27°? He must have had good reasons for so doing; and Bernou has no difficulty in finding a few. First, there are the prevailing north winds in the Gulf, which would force La Salle to land higher than latitude 27°; then, there is the fear of the Spaniards who must not be far away toward the south; and finally, lest "M. de Beaujeu, who is an expert sailor, should attribute to himself the honor of discovering the mouth of the river if he had found it directly."⁵⁷

There are finally two other texts which will be set down before passing to another latitude of the mouth of the Mississippi. In 1691, the author of the *First Establishment of the Faith* wrote: "Although he [La Salle] kept to himself the exact point, we have learned that the river falls into the Gulf of Mexico between latitudes 27° and 28°."⁵⁸ How this author had learned this is not said, but since he was probably a member of the Bernou-Renaudot coterie, it is not surprising that his position of the mouth of the Mississippi does not greatly differ from what Bernou had written. The second testimony is that of Joutel. The pseudo-Tonti had written that the river emptied into the Gulf at latitude 22°,⁵⁹ but, said Joutel: "La Salle always looked for it between 27° and 28°."⁶⁰

From all these texts, it should be clear that the latitude which La Salle read on his astrolabe at the mouth of the Mississippi in 1682 was 27 degrees. But on his way to the Gulf, while at Petit Goave, he changed what he had so often said previously. He wrote

⁵⁷ *Id. to id.*, August 28, 1685, *ibid.*, 259v-260v. Cf. Bernou to Vilermont, September 4, 1685, BN, Mss. fr., 7516: 26.

⁵⁸ C. Le Clercq, *First Establishment of the Faith in New France*, 2 vols., New York, 1881, 2: 237.

⁵⁹ In the *Dernières découvertes*, p. 192, the pseudo-Tonti says between 22 and 23 degrees.

⁶⁰ ASH, 115-9: no. 12.

to Beaujeu that, if they separated, Beaujeu should wait for him either at Cabo San Antonio, or at the Isle aux Pins or at any other place he chose; if they happen to separate beyond this cape, he should wait for him at the Baye du St. Esprit. "I am declaring to you, he tells him, that I shall enter the mouth of the river by latitude $28^{\circ} 20'$. This is situated at the end of the Gulf."⁶¹ Why Margry should have italicized the words: "*où je vous déclare qu'est l'embouchure de la rivière où je prétends entrer tout au font de l'anse du golfe,*" is incomprehensible, unless he did not realize that La Salle had said that the mouth of the river was at latitude 27° . This new latitude is not a mistake or a misprint; for Beaujeu answered on the same day that he would be at latitude $28^{\circ} 20'$, if perchance they should be separated.⁶²

On January 23, 1685, La Salle dates his letter "from the mouth of one of the branches of the Colbert River";⁶³ on February 3, "from the mouth of a river which I believe to be one of the mouths of the Mississippi";⁶⁴ on February 18, "from the mouth of the Colbert River";⁶⁵ and finally, on March 4, he wrote to Seignelay from "the western mouth of the Colbert River."⁶⁶ La Salle was undoubtedly convinced that he was at the mouth or at one of the mouths of the Mississippi, yet he was not at the latitude he had read on his astrolabe in 1682. On February 3, he told Beaujeu that he would not go farther west [*i.e.*, south], for he was sure he had passed the mouth of the river. "You know that I have always said that I found 22 degrees on my astrolabe,"⁶⁷ and if I should have been mistaken by 20 minutes when I wrote to you from Cabo San Antonio,⁶⁸ it was because I was in a hurry as I am now." Yet, if he had indeed read 27 degrees on his astrolabe, he should have gone farther south, for on February 3, he was slightly above latitude 28° . His whole trouble seems to have been that he was in a "hurry." He did not seem to have realized the importance of taking accurate latitudes. As a matter of fact, his only correct latitude is that of Chicago, which he mentions in his letter of March, 1683.⁶⁹

Although, as we have already said, La Salle could not compute longitudes, there is a point which involved this coordinate in the

⁶¹ La Salle to Beaujeu, November 23, 1684, Margry, 2: 522.

⁶² Beaujeu to La Salle, November 23, 1684, *ibid.*, 524.

⁶³ Margry, 2: 526.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 528.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 546.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 559.

⁶⁷ See the note in *ibid.*, 530.

⁶⁸ Minet mentions this letter in the extract from his journal. *Ibid.*, 592.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 166.

navigation of 1684-1685. On January 1, 1685, La Salle said that they were a little west of Cape Escondido, whereas the pilots of the *Joly* thought that they were near Matas de Salvador.⁷⁰ If, as seems probable, La Salle and the pilots had a map of the Gulf similar to that of Minet, then Cape Escondido was in the middle of the northern coast, and the pilots were four degrees west of this cape. If, by using Minet's map, we were to convert the longitude of Cape Escondido, 285°, and Matas de Salvador, 281°, and if we were to take as a basis the meridian which passes west of the Floridan peninsula, 294°, then La Salle should have been on the Mississippi, and the pilots in the vicinity of Lake Calcasieu.

On January 4, they figured that they were at latitude 29° 20',⁷¹ and from then on they went farther away from the mouth of the Mississippi. On January 19, when the ships met again, latitude 27° 55' was observed.⁷² On the following day, they went out on the launch to take their position. "The launch had trouble entering the channel. M. de la Salle who also landed was not pleased that they had taken the latitude."⁷³ This is in keeping with what Beaujeu wrote to Seignelay, when they were still in Rochefort. La Salle had told the captain that nobody should take the latitude. Beaujeu answered that he would remove all the instruments, but that it was impossible to prevent his sailors from computing their position; for, unless La Salle hid the sun, two stick were all that was needed.⁷⁴

La Salle's confusion is also evident from Minet's journal. According to this account, La Salle said on February 1, that the mouth of the Mississippi was forty leagues to the northeast; on the 15th, that he was at the place where his Majesty had sent him; and finally, two days later, that he was at the mouth of his river.⁷⁵ In his letter to Seignelay, Minet added: "His latitude is faulty, for he has no good instrument to take it."⁷⁶

La Salle himself had to give some kind of explanation to Seignelay for all these delays seriously jeopardized the purpose of the expedition. He was forced, he wrote to the minister, to go as far down as latitude 27° 30' to find the *Joly*, which he finally met on February 14; but "the season being already far advanced, there was little time to complete the undertaking of which I was charged."

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 593.

⁷¹ Journal of Desmanville, *ibid.*, 513.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 513.

⁷³ This passage is not in Margry.

⁷⁴ Beaujeu to Seignelay, June 21, 1684, Margry, 2: 400.

⁷⁵ Minet's extract from his journal, *ibid.*, 586, 598.

⁷⁶ Minet to Seignelay, July 7, 1685, *ibid.*, 603.

He resolved to ascend the "small channel of the Colbert River," rather than go back to the "larger channel" twenty-five or thirty leagues from the place where he now was. This larger channel had been sighted on January 6; the pilots, however, thought that they were still east of the Baye du St. Esprit. "But the latitude showed that the pilots were mistaken, and what we saw on January 3, was indeed the main entrance of the river which we sought." If spring had not been so near, he went on to say, he would have returned, but he was afraid of having to spend the rest of the winter going north into the wind. He would rather ascend the river at this place and would "beg M. de Beaujeu to reconnoiter the other mouth and notify your Highness" of what he found there. "The mouth of the Colbert River is situated at latitude 28 degrees and 18 or 20 minutes."⁷⁷

We are omitting all comments on La Salle's chase after the *Joly*, and are confining ourselves to the determination of his actual latitude. If we add one degree—twenty-five or thirty leagues—to latitude 28° 30', this would place him at latitude 29° 30';⁷⁸ which was supposedly the place where he had calculated his position in 1682, a position which he had repeatedly said was 27°. As for Beaujeu reconnoitering the larger channel of the river at the latitude indicated, one may ask why did not La Salle go himself? After all, twenty-five or thirty leagues, even if the wind was blowing from the north was not a great feat; and we should not forget that the filibusters of Santo Domingo had said that the north wind stopped in March.⁷⁹ This text about Beaujeu going north, which Margry italicized, proves two things: first, that La Salle wanted to get rid of the sailor who was convinced that La Salle was lost, and second, that Beaujeu did not "abandon" La Salle on the Texas coast.

If, as seems probable, La Salle calculated his position near Venice, Louisiana, he should have found 29° 42', a latitude which has not changed, for this point is too far inland. If he had made allowance for possible error, his latitude in 1682, should have been 29° or 30°. Instead of these positions, he had read 27 degrees on his astrolabe, that is between two and three degrees too low. When his attention was called to the defective astrolabe—probably by Minet—he said that the position of 1682 was 28° 20'. At Matagorda Bay, conscious that he had added more than one degree to the latitude of 1682, he obstinately maintained that this was the place to which

⁷⁷ La Salle to Seignelay, March 4, 1685, *ibid.*, 559 f.

⁷⁸ On January 2, 1685, they were at latitude 29° 20'. Journal of Joutel in Margry, 3: 119.

⁷⁹ Beaujeu to Seignelay, October 25, 1684, Margry, 2: 489.

the king had sent him, and dispatched Beaujeu to look for the main entrance of the river another degree higher.

The question now is to ascertain whether La Salle came to Paris in 1684 with a map of his discoveries, and whether this map or a copy thereof was different from that which Franquelin drew in 1684. That La Salle had a map is clear from what Tronson said.⁸⁰ Besides this reference, there are many other texts which speak of a map made by or for La Salle, the explorer. Thus Bernou wrote to Renaudot that La Salle's map "will serve as an ornament to the work" which they planned to write;⁸¹ and a week later, he wrote again telling his friend to send as soon as possible the map of M. de la Salle.⁸² In March 1684, Bernou having heard from Villermont that the latter had seen "a map six feet square," he wondered why Renaudot had not sent a smaller one "a foot and a half square";⁸³ and in the same month, after receiving a letter from La Salle, Bernou said: "He promised to send me a map, as well as memoirs and relations."⁸⁴

Renaudot must have written that no map would be sent to Bernou for he answered: "With regard to the map, what you are telling me is quite reasonable. I have told it to the Cardinal [d'Estrées], who approves of it and will do what is needed at the right time and place."⁸⁵ Later, he fears that La Salle will leave France without giving Renaudot a copy of his map; he would like to have a rough draft "from the Illinois to the sea to help understand what he writes; it is unbelievable that he did not make a draft of his map which he could have left with you."⁸⁶ Finally, in answer to Villermont's criticism that La Salle did not find the marks left at the mouth of the Mississippi, Bernou said that these marks "were on the map which he [La Salle] gave to M. de Seignelay . . . as for the map, I saw a copy made on the original; this copy has been sent to Rome by Seignelay for some other affair."⁸⁷

The second question into which we wish to inquire is whether the map made by La Salle was different from that of 1684. To this we must answer that we do not know; but considering the similarity between Franquelin's map of 1684 and that of Minet of 1685, which were both based on that of La Salle, the probability is that

⁸⁰ Margry, 2: 355, and Tronson to Belmont, [May], 1687, no. 339.

⁸¹ Bernou to Renaudot, February 1, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497: 89.

⁸² *Id.* to *id.*, February 8, 1684, *ibid.*, 92.

⁸³ *Id.* to *id.*, March 14, 1684, *ibid.*, 104.

⁸⁴ *Id.* to *id.*, March 28, 1684, Margry, 3: 79.

⁸⁵ *Id.* to *id.*, April 4, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497: 114.

⁸⁶ *Id.* to *id.*, May 2, 1684, *ibid.*, 123.

⁸⁷ *Id.* to *id.*, August 14, 1685, *ibid.*, 245v.

there was no essential difference between these three maps. What happened is that having at hand a man who knew Canada, who had already made several maps of that country, Franquelin was ordered to make a copy of La Salle's draft.⁸⁸ Franquelin, however, was soon involved in *l'affaire Tonti*. It would seem that La Salle took occasion to withhold a sum of money which he had promised Alphonse Tonti, the brother of Henri, because of some disparaging remarks which Alphonse had made about La Salle. The latter's opinion of Franquelin may be gathered from a letter which Beaujeu wrote from Rochefort on this matter.

Just before receiving your last letter of May 29, I was speaking to M. de la Salle about M. [Alphonse] Tonti and was telling him what you had written about his draughtsman, Franclin [sic] by name. He answered that if he [Franquelin] had been present when Sieur de Tonti said what he did, and if he had reported the same, he himself would not have believed it; but Messrs. de la Forest and Barbier were also there, and they assured La Salle that they had heard Tonti say the same thing.⁸⁹

Franquelin's supposed betrayal of La Salle's confidence is referred to in the same letter. The unusual means employed by La Salle in order to keep secret the expedition to the Gulf of Mexico have been discussed elsewhere.⁹⁰ As a matter of fact, the "secret" was so well kept that in March 1684, a gazette published in Holland gave the European reading public full details about the destination and the route of the expedition; but the map, which La Salle had made was kept concealed. This map is referred to further down in the letter just quoted.

A propos of his [La Salle's] map, he said the other day to M. Minet, our engineer, that it was going to be printed in Paris; that M. Tausier, a clerk of M. de Seignelay in charge of the fortifications, must have given it to somebody, and that it would not be to the liking of M. le Marquis [de Seignelay]. I myself see that La Salle's draughtsman is responsible for this. I am asking you, if possible to get a copy of the map, and you may pay as much as two *pistoles* for it. My nephew will reimburse you, but I must have it before I leave. An outline will be enough.⁹¹

The surmise of Beaujeu may or may not have been correct, for La Salle himself has given to M. Tronson "a very beautiful map" of the country he had discovered. At the end of June, 1684, Tonti arrived at Rochefort. He and La Forest went to La Rochelle to patch

⁸⁸ "Franquelin, Mapmaker," *MID-AMERICA*, 25 (1943) 54 ff. What follows is taken from this article.

⁸⁹ Beaujeu to Villermont, June 5, 1684, Margry, 2: 426 f.

⁹⁰ *Some La Salle Journeys*, 85.

⁹¹ Beaujeu to Villermont, June 5, 1684, Margry, 2: 429.

up matters with La Salle. Of this meeting Beaujeu says: "They had a long explanation and Franquelin was blamed for everything. Sieur de la Forest denied that he had ever spoken unfavorably of Sieur de Barbier reported to him what Sieur de Tonti had said."⁹² La Salle, however, was not quite convinced by the "explanation." He demanded that Tonti be confronted with Barbier, Franquelin, and a few others, in whose presence Tonti had spoken disparagingly. When Tonti refused to agree to this, La Salle would not permit him to accompany the expedition to the Gulf of Mexico.

Because the engineer Minet made a map based on that of La Salle, and because this map, for all that pertains to the Mississippi, is similar to that of Franquelin, we shall ascertain what we know about the engineer before taking up the analysis of the two maps.

First of all, we do not know his first name. He was undoubtedly sent to build a fort which was to be the base of operations against New Biscay. Before leaving France La Salle and Minet seem to have been on good terms.⁹³ La Salle wanted to borrow money from him; and when the latter said that he did not have any, he was told to ask the intendant for a year's salary in advance.⁹⁴ La Salle had greater confidence in Minet than in Beaujeu;⁹⁵ he told the engineer that the captain was not quite frank and that he did not know why.⁹⁶ This confidence, however, did not last. La Salle took it amiss that Minet visited the intendant so often, and he made veiled threats, which angered the engineer.⁹⁷

After the expedition reached the Texas coast, the harmony, which had somehow continued,⁹⁸ was disturbed once for all on the following occasion. Minet took pity on the members of the expedition who were dying along the sandy coast, while La Salle was insisting every place they stopped that that was where the king had sent him.⁹⁹ In the extract from his journal, Minet says that La Salle "should rather have given food to the soldiers, and that he should embark, and that they would go all together find his river." But this suggestion was received with ridicule.¹⁰⁰ By this time, February 1, it was clear that La Salle was lost, and that he would

⁹² *Id. to id.*, June 18 [i.e., 28], 1684, *ibid.*, 437.

⁹³ Beaujeu to Villermont, June, 1684, *ibid.*, 424; *id. to id.*, June 15, 1674, *ibid.*, 435.

⁹⁴ Minet to Seignelay, July 7, 1685, *ibid.*, 602 f.

⁹⁵ Beaujeu to Villermont, June 5, 1684, *ibid.*, 429.

⁹⁶ *Id. to id.*, June 1684, *ibid.*, 242.

⁹⁷ *Id. to id.*, July 10, 1684, *ibid.*, 450, 452.

⁹⁸ *L'expédition de Cavelier de la Salle*, 21.

⁹⁹ Minet to Seignelay, July 7, 1684, Margry, 2: 603.

¹⁰⁰ Extract from Minet's journal, *ibid.*, 597.

resent any suggestion may made to him by anybody. On the following day, La Salle wrote to Beaujeu saying that Minet had no authority to write to him as though he were a minister.¹⁰¹ Minet could leave, for he himself was a sufficiently able engineer to do what the kind had commanded.¹⁰²

But La Salle soon changed his tune, and sent summons to Beaujeu to force Minet to land. It was, he said, "more for the interest of the king than for myself."¹⁰³ The answer came on the following day: "I am not keeping M. Minet; he can land or stay on board." The orders of the king were simply that Beaujeu had to keep Minet on board ship as long as the captain was at sea. He could not dismiss him, unless La Salle showed him orders different from those which had been given at La Rochelle.¹⁰⁴ To this La Salle replied that if Minet had orders different "from those which I saw," let him follow them; he had done his duty when he sent the summons.¹⁰⁵ By this time Beaujeu realized what the situation was on the coast, and had no intention of ousting the engineer; furthermore, "you will be able to find someone who knows more than M. Minet, about whom you have told me several times that you could do without him."¹⁰⁶

La Salle went so far as to write to Seignelay about the engineer. The minister's orders came to Arnoul, the intendant at La Rochelle:

With regard to Sieur Minet, he was wrong in not staying with Sieur de la Salle, according to the orders which you had given him. Instead of obeying, he took upon himself to send La Salle impertinent letters. His Majesty has ordered his arrest; he shall be sent to the tower of La Rochelle.¹⁰⁷

Minet's imprisonment lasted only five weeks, after which he was sent to serve under Vauban. He occupied his leisure time at La Rochelle in revising his journal and in drawing up "a list of sixty-five questions which he wanted La Salle to answer when the latter returned to France. A few of these questions which concern his morals and his religion appear indiscreet; a small number show prejudice; but most of them are very much to the point."¹⁰⁸ This unpublished journal was sold at auction in Paris in 1934. Before the war, I located the owner with a view to buy it, but as he was

¹⁰¹ La Salle to Beaujeu, February 6, 1685, *ibid.*, 533.

¹⁰² *L'expédition de Cavelier de la Salle*, 162.

¹⁰³ La Salle to Beaujeu, February 17, 1685, Margry, 2: 542.

¹⁰⁴ Beaujeu to La Salle, February 17, 1685, *ibid.*, 544.

¹⁰⁵ La Salle to Beaujeu, February 18, 1685, *ibid.*, 548.

¹⁰⁶ Beaujeu to La Salle, February 18, 1685, *ibid.*, 550.

¹⁰⁷ Seignelay to Arnoul, July 22, 1685, *ibid.*, 605.

¹⁰⁸ *L'expédition de Cavelier de la Salle*, 162.

asking an outrageous price, I dropped the matter. What became of this manuscript I do not know.

What Margry published is an extract from this journal, which as De Villiers said in 1931, "like many other documents unfavorable to La Salle has mysteriously disappeared some fifty years ago." In the archives in Paris there is no trace of the original from which Margry made his extract, nor of the extract itself. De Villiers thought that Minet wrote two different journals, and that there were contradictions between what Margry printed and the complete autograph journal. I think, however, that Minet himself made the extract, as the title of it indicates: "Extrait de nostre voyage fait dans le golfe de Mexique."¹⁰⁹ He also said in his letter to Seignelay: "I am sending you the maps and plans of the places where we have been. You will see on the plan of the coast of Florida the place where we left M. de la Salle; the extract from the journal indicates what that country is and in brief what was done there."¹¹⁰

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Loyola University, Chicago.

¹⁰⁹ Margry, 2: 591.

¹¹⁰ Minet to Seignelay, July 7, 1685, *ibid.*, 602.

Book Reviews

The Whig Party in Georgia, 1825-1853. By Paul Murray. The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. 29, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1948. Pp. vii, 219.

This work may well be rated as one of the most solid studies in political science that has recently appeared. Mr. Murray has done what a scholar should do and has brought forth a volume that scholars will appreciate. He has gathered his documents well and has been diligent in consulting other men in the field. He has assessed his materials in a mature manner in the light of the particular and general development of party politics. He has presented his interpretations with objective restraint and with due deference to varying opinions. The result is a formally organized, clear-cut study, which begins with definitions of terms, proceeds orderly with the facts, and ends with a summary of his findings or interpretations. This, in view of the vogue of clever, or "thought stimulating" writing, is an achievement in itself, over and above the contribution of content. Needless to say, a book of such type extends its interest and its scope beyond what the title might indicate, Georgia's politics and the years 1825 to 1853.

By 1832, Mr. Murray says, the Whig party of Georgia answered the definition of a political party, in that it had a distinct personnel of leaders and followers, was bound together by a body of political tenets, and left records of its organization. The leaders of statewide note for twenty years were college graduates in comfortable financial standing. The local leaders were also property minded, substantial agrarians. The followers cast their votes not so much through party adherence as for some sectional or private interest which the leaders advocated. The party doctrines were consistently conservative, that is, preservative of the status quo, offering neither remedy for pressing problems nor progressive programs. Even while the leading personnel remained the same, the organization was termed the Troup party, State Rights party, State Rights-Whig party, and finally the Whig party of Georgia, the Georgia contingent of the national party of the monied aristocracy.

The second chapter describes the cornerstones of the Whig party as they were laid from 1825 to 1831 by the Troup party. Loyalty to leaders of family prestige was established, while local leaders came on the scene and aided in two basic developments: a shift toward electing congressmen by total number of votes, and the centralization of political power in the legislative caucus (which gave way within a few years to the nomination procedure.) Mr. Murray states without much qualification that the state convention method of choosing candidates was adopted not because of the abuses deriving from the caucus, but as a far better force for discipline in the party. In the third chapter the defeat of the Troup party on the questions of the Cherokee lands, nullification of federal tariff laws, internal improvements, education, the constitutional convention, and points of local administration led to Troup's retirement, to the rise of new leaders, and to the reorganization of the party along state rights lines. From 1843 to 1839 this State Rights party established a minority position, stressing the right of a state to revolt from federal authority, state sovereignty, and nullification, and debating every issue with the majority Union party. Its philosophy and idealism received a decisive defeat in the 1839 elections, but its persistent sniping

thwarted the Union party platform of direct state relief for distressed business and free-white government.

How this States Rights party merged with the nation's Whigs between 1839 and 1844, and how Georgia politics became geared to national issues from 1842 to 1848, are the subjects of the next two chapters. The confusion of political lines and the confusing behavior about sectional and economic problems in Georgia within the Democrat, Union, and Whig parties, to say nothing of that arising over national issues, is amply dissolved, or at least organized into a readable form. The Georgia Whig party in its declining days after 1848 followed directions from the Washington headquarters, bequeathing its more capable leaders to the Union-Democrat party.

In his preface Mr. Murray states: "I have no apology if other students with similar interests find in this presentation of nineteenth century politics many parallels with the struggles of more recent date which have had a dramatic quality sufficient to familiarize magazine readers of the nation with the names of Ed Rivers, Eugene Talmadge, and Ellis Arnall." Had his book been published after the 1948 presidential election he might well have extended his remark to the parallel between the Whig party of Georgia and the present party of the second part. There is a lesson to be learned from this analysis and synthesis.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago.

* * * *

Footprints on the Frontier. By Sister M. Evangeline. Thomas Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland. Pp. xiv, 400.

This book is a very careful piece of historical research on the history of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Concordia, Kansas. It is the sort of record which will always remain as a source book for the group about which it is written and about the history of the Catholic Church in Kansas. The author seems to have left no source of information unexamined. There are much more than the usual summaries and means of indicating the growth of the small community of nuns. We are given listings of educational institutions which are under the jurisdiction of the St. Joseph nuns, the number of pupils in them and the parent house from which they were founded. In all, one may say that the book gives its subject complete coverage to the least detail.

The history of the St. Joseph nuns in Kansas well merits retelling by an expert. If one recalls that Kansas is not noted for its Catholicity it can well be imagined with what great difficulty the Sisters attacked the problem of selling themselves to their hostile surroundings as well as supporting themselves and expanding their institutions. Nuns are far more capable of performing near miracles in such circumstances than are men religious. It is, of course, only too evident that nuns are the backbone of the Church in America. And in Kansas the St. Joseph nuns of Concordia were often not only the backbone, but nearly the whole body. Their work there was heroic in its extension. It deserves the careful record it has received.

If there be any valid criticism to be offered to this book one may suggest that the story becomes submerged at times in the careful scholarship which was employed to tell it. The author is conscientious about her research. She

offers hardly a paragraph which she does not in some manner document for the benefit of the reader. Further, when sources cited are not readily available she has reprinted sufficient selections to allow the reader to judge for himself of the value of the source. This is certainly praiseworthy historical scholarship, but also the detail sometimes causes the reader to lose the thread of the story.

Let it not be thought that the criticism is to be taken as a serious defect. Too frequently the history of Catholic institutions has been presented with no scholarly background. It is only when such work as that of the present author becomes universally true of historical writing about the Church in America that may we hope to produce a monumental history of Catholicity in the United States.

Sister M. Evangeline has written a fine, scholarly work. Her book merits support from everyone. It is a solid chapter in the history of the West.

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

St. Louis University.

* * * *

The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant. By Edward George Hartmann, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. 333.

Just prior to our entrance into World War I there developed marked interest in the "Americanization" of the foreign born who were living in this nation. The movement had as its particular target those who had not become American citizens. It was fallaciously assumed that those who had become citizens were good "Americans" whereas those who had not, were not to be trusted. It is hardly necessary to discuss further this utterly erroneous conception. After we had entered the war, the Germans and the Austrians were the particular concern of the "do-gooders" of that era. What was accomplished by the multitude of "Americanizing" agencies during the period from about 1915 to 1921 is the subject of this dissertation. The subject is treated calmly and honestly, and it must be emphasized, thoroughly.

Literally dozens of Committees, such as the Committee on Immigration, the National Americanization Committee, and the Committee for Immigrants in America, became involved in the undertaking. Over one hundred cities, of all sizes and in all parts of the nation, staged active Americanization programs during 1917. More than twenty-five large corporations carried on the same type of work during that year. Anyone who spoke a foreign language was considered a threat to national security. Anyone who wanted to keep alive in this country any of the practices of his native land was considered a person who should be deported. Every alien was to become adept in English, even though many native born citizens could hardly read or write the language. An alien, despite a blameless record in his community, was told that he must become a citizen. It was assumed that by subjecting the alien to a "citizenship-training" program, he could be improved. Many states passed laws against the use of foreign languages for instruction in basic subjects in the schools. The Hungarian-American Loyalty League and the Friends of German Democracy and similar organizations were supposed to reach groups not easily contacted by those with *Mayflower*

ancestry. Great celebrations were held on July 4, 1918 for the special benefit of those who were about to become American citizens. Delegates of thirty-three nationalities were sent on a pilgrimage to the tomb of Washington, as special guests of President Wilson.

In retrospect the whole thing does look rather silly. While the war was going on, however, anyone who would have criticized the mumbo jumbo would have been thrown into jail for "opposing the war effort." By 1919, however, American citizens were regaining the liberty that is always lost during war, and some pungent criticisms appeared, especially in publications intended for the foreign born. In 1919, it was possible to say that the "Americanization" of 1916-18 resembled the persecution in an earlier day of the Jews and Poles in Russia. Poles were urged not to deny their mother tongue. Mass naturalization was said to smack decidedly of Prussianism, and to be at variance with American ideals and freedom. More sensible Americans, such as Alfred E. Smith and Franklin K. Lane spoke up at last in defense of the foreign born who wished to keep alive in this country some of the traditions of their native land. Gradually sanity returned; the immigrants breathed easier, and went on advancing themselves and enriching the land of their adoption, as they had been doing before the word "Americanization" was coined.

An exceptionally detailed bibliography of approximately seventy-five pages greatly increases the value of this excellent book. Anyone interested in immigration will find this book a very useful addition to his library.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University, Chicago

* * * *

The Inquisition at Albi: 1299-1300. Text of Register and Analysis. By Georgene W. Davis. Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, Number 538. Columbia University Press, New York, 1948. Pp. 322.

A strange trial occurred in the town of Albi in southern France at the end of 1299 A. D. and during 1300. Twenty-five wealthy residents of the vicinity were suddenly arrested by officers of the medieval Inquisition. Charged by the court with heresy these influential men were speedily condemned. Accounts of the trial left medievalists puzzled about the reasons for the haste in the arrests and convictions, so complex were the charges and testimonies. The scholars agree that the episode is highly mysterious, but they have ventured various opinions to no suitable conclusion. The bishop presiding at the trials had the proceedings of the court officially written in Latin. This manuscript register is presented by Miss Davis as the core of her study. She offers a careful edition of the text and an historical criticism which is well worth the study of any advanced student. She reaches the conclusion that there is no evidence for any apodictic interpretation of the event. Her analysis of the interests which made the trials so complex is sharp, and apparently complete, if we judge by the extensive bibliography and the painstaking footnote citations. The book has value as a pattern of study and as an example of the stranger ways of inquisitorial procedure. The publisher has made its format pleasing, even to the servicable index.

JOSEPH ROUBIK

Loyola University, Chicago

Notes and Comments

After the episodes of the egg and tomato throwing in the presidential campaign of fresh memory, to say nothing of the verbal vituperatives hurled, one may readily subscribe to the general statements of Charles O. Lerche, Jr., in the October 1948 *William and Mary Quarterly*, that "personal assault and defamation—the "smear"—have been most widely resorted to during the quadrennial struggle for the Presidency. No national election has taken place since 1796 without some attempt being made to damage a candidate's reputation by innuendo, rumor and ridicule." Mr. Lerche's remarks appear in his very interesting and instructive article: "Jefferson and the Election of 1800: A Case Study in the Political Smear." Most savage have been the campaigns when the established order seemed in peril. Why do we accept a technique so contrary to public decency, based on calumny? The author advances two general reasons, namely, the craving for "power to advance one's own interests and to destroy those of an adversary," and the craving for victory at all costs and by any means. Mr. Lerche then holds up the election of 1800 as an excellent case for studying the use of the smear, stating: "The devotion of Jefferson's enemies to the task of picturing him as a monster is both amazing and instructive." He then analyzes the smear process whereby Jefferson's opponents attempted to make him infamous as an atheist, an impractical dreamer and philosopher, a defamer of Washington, a French revolutionist, a defrauder of widows, a coward, a dishonest business man, an adulterer, and lecher. Blatherskites foresaw in his election no end of burning churches, atrocities, rape, stabbings, and general ruin. And so, Jefferson was elected.

Mr. Lerche's conclusions and the moral which he draws are well worth quoting in full. Villification, slander, abuse, do not win elections; rather they are more apt to prove boomerangs. "Personal villification has never stopped the long-range trends of American political development." The slander technique in the case of Jefferson was based on the assumption that the voters were stupid and venal, whereas Mr. Lerche "has long been convinced that most professional politicians underestimate the political sophistication of the American people." The evil that the Federalists did to Jefferson's character lives to the present among historians who wrangle about his atheism, his revolutionary philosophy, and his administrative ability.

The article is very timely in many respects. Just at present a questionnaire is in circulation among the chairmen of the departments of political science in American universities, requesting information for an estimate of the part played by colleges and universities in the formation of practical citizens and political leaders. The detailed questions reveal a concern over the apathy of students and faculty where participation in government is concerned. In view of their knowledge of the smear technique and other sordid elements of politics as we tolerate them, it is not surprising that university people are chary about getting into a "game" wherein divorcement from ethics and morality seems a major premise. What can be done to make an attractive vocation out of what is, under the spoils system, a state of temporary sycophancy, may be found basically in this article.

Nor is this the only interesting study in this number of *The William and Mary Quarterly*. Perry Miller of the English Department of Harvard writes on "The Religious Impulse in the Founding of Virginia: Religion and Society in the Early Literature." To him the settlement of Virginia was not primarily a commercial venture. The writings of the first settlers, taken at their face value, show that the basic reason for the settlement by the Virginia Company, the impules, the pervading force, seems to be religion. The sermons, broadsides, and letters reveal the Virginians as honestly pious, not hypocritical; they came to the wilderness feeling that they were doing the will of God, there to work out their salvation in prayer, fasting, and good works. Their belief in God (the "Protestant God," as Mr. Miller has it) and their belief in their predestination as the elect of God, was, despite sundry sins, the energizing power of the colony in its trying days, and they differed only in their geographical location from the New England Puritans.

* * * *

Professor William B. Hesseltine has seized the opportunity to write *The Rise and Fall of Third Parties From Anti-Masonry to Wallace*, which has been published by Public Affairs Press, Washington. The book of 119 pages stems from the authors contributions to *Progressive*. It is not designed to be a history, but rather an instruction to future third parties on how to avoid mistakes and make friends for liberalism. Perhaps, many of the suggestions will be taken by readers as satire. Some of his interpretations of the political issues of the last fifty years will certainly be "stimulating" to progressives, old dealers and New Dealers alike, and this is prob-

ably what Professor Hesseltine desires to accomplish. He would have some intelligence, or intellectual bases, in future party platforms. People may bristle at this if they meditate on the inferences possible. The liberals of bygone days decried militarism and urged liberalization of the democratic processes, while fighting against any infringement on the civil liberties of the people.

* * * *

The failure of the Democrats in the 1860 election is explained by Professor Roy Franklin Nichols in his recent *The Disruption of American Democracy*, (Macmillan, 1948). In the critical Democrat convention held at Charleston in 1860 some southern delegates were bargaining to establish the southern as the party platform in return for a compromise candidate. The party disintegrated, apparently by reason of such bickerings, but chiefly because of the individualism in the state parties, the Lecompton constitution, and the personalities of the Democratic leaders. The pen pictures of Stephen A. Douglas, James Buchanan and others, are sharp, and the motives of the leaders as indicated leave little room for edification. The general impression left in the mind of the reader is that the psychological or personal attitudes of men in politics were far more important as causes of the Civil War than has been thought heretofore.

* * * *

The State Historical Society of Missouri, A Semicentennial History, by Floyd C. Shoemaker, has been published at Columbia, Missouri. Even though there are as many state historical societies as there are States in the Union, this is only the fourth history of such a society to appear. Mr. Shoemaker by reason of his thirty-eight years of work as an officer of the State Historical Society of Missouri and his long association with members of this and other state historical societies is perfectly familiar with the organized historical developments in this country. His interest and untiring zeal in promoting interest in local societies has been matched by few and his care in gathering and preserving all available records of the past of his State is known and appreciated among historians.

Mr. Shoemaker divides his book into four agreeable sections. In the first he traces the rise and progress of historical societies around the nation, placing his society in its proper relation to the wider field. The second part is devoted to the foundations from 1901 to 1914, especially to the legal basis and the establishment of the authority under the State law to hold the historical properties as

a trustee of the State of Missouri. Other foundations, the library, the home of the Society, the founding staff, and the membership are described. The third part is concerned with the building of the Society from 1915-1940, and this is a notable chapter of achievement. The collections obtained, the celebrations sponsored, the historical activities promoted, and the publications each come in for a brief description. The last part surveys the Society as a mature institution capable of carrying out its task as a preserver and dispenser of history.

The book is of 193 pages very attractively printed and illustrated. The appendices include the constitution and by-laws of the society. A good bibliography and index round out the work.

* * * *

The British are likely to take more kindly to the presidents of the United States than the Americans, if the trend toward "debunking" presidents (and presidential candidates) continues here and the Teach Yourself History Library Series continues to publish such popular works as *Woodrow Wilson and American Liberalism*. This biographical series, edited by A. L. Rowse of All Souls College and published by Macmillan, aims at broader movements, centering them around a prominent figure. The author of this particular volume, E. M. Hugh-Jones, apparently gleaned many of the details from uncorrected term papers of college students, who are inclined to use their own discretion in the matter of spelling and exact dates, but manage to present the general idea." The British college boys and girls will be able to read a sympathetic account of our presidents, while skipping various details which, even though erroneous, will not eventuate in a war with the United States. Mr. Rowse has written *The Use of History* as the introductory volume of this series.

* * * *

What the British students are taught in their textbooks about the "insurrection" of the Anglo-American colonists in 1776, namely, that the "military phase was badly handled" by the home office, is proved by John Richard Alden in *General Gage in America: Being Principally a History of His Role in the American Revolution*, (Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1948). The biography gives many details of the life of General Gage, prior to and after the one year before Bunker Hill, the year that gave him a place in the American sun. Handsome, but no military genius, he failed and was recalled by London chiefly because he told the truth about the

American frame of mind which he saw clearly but was not astute enough to meet. London did not want the truth; the Lords evidently wanted a genius to pry them out of the difficulty. Thus, the affair was "badly handled."

* * * *

To see how much the proposals of the Pope for a just and lasting peace in the world have been listened to and to discover what effect they have had upon the writings of journalists in America was the problem for a group of students in the School of Journalism of Marquette University. How are the Pope's ideas reflected in our press? An answer is now published by the Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, in the form of a master's thesis: *A Study of Reflections of the Peace Proposals of Pope Pius XII in the Writings of David Lawrence*, by Sister Catherine Joseph Wilcox, S.P., M.A. The writings of Lawrence cover a period of thirty-six years of work as correspondent, columnist, author, and editor more recently of *United States News* and *World Report*. He was selected as a subject because of his recognized prestige in editorial writings. Though Lawrence is not a Catholic, his fundamental principles for a lasting peace are in agreement with those enunciated from time to time by the present Pope, and his criticism is invariably directed against movements and policies subversive of justice, charity, religion, morality, and freedom.

* * * *

Prisoners of War was published in June, 1948, by the Institute of World Polity, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. This Institute has among its projects the study "of ways and means of improving the future treatment of prisoners of war." The students engaged in this project have been prisoners of war. This brochure in a hundred pages is the result of their studies to the time of publication. It begins with a history of the effort, a sketch of the participants; a survey of the rules governing prisoners of war from capture to liberation, protective agencies, a suggested new convention and other international remedies comprise the body of the work.

* * * *

Life and Voyages of Louis Jolliet 1645-1700, by Jean Delanglez, is the sixth volume of the Institute of Jesuit History Publications, Loyola University, Chicago. This volume brings together in 289 pages all that is known of the famous discoverer of the upper Mississippi and his various voyages. Two appendices contain an edited

"Voyage de Jolliet a la Baie d'Hudson" of Jacques Rousseau, and "A Callendar of Jolliet Documents." There are seven maps, a bibliography, and index. The book will be a necessary reference work for those engaged in the study of the early history of the Mississippi Valley and the seventeenth century developments in Canada.

* * * *

Students of Michigan now have a textbook for their study of the history of their State. *Michigan: from Primitive Wilderness to Industrial Commonwealth*, by Milo M. Quaife and Sidney Glazer, published as one of its series of State histories by Prentice-Hall, Inc., is a welcome addition to the series. Dr. Quaife, whose familiarity with the early times of the Northwest Territory made him the logical candidate to write the story to 1837, uses his mature vision of the past in his broader approach. Students will like his short chapters and the vivid manner in which the "main point" is placed before them. Dr. Glazer does remarkably well in getting the last one hundred and ten years of Michigan's history within two hundred pages while keeping it in its proper relation to our national industrialization. The vision of Michigan readers of this work will not be limited to the Michigan horizon.

* * * *

The Bank of Venezuela has sponsored the publication of the Volume XI of the *Cartas del Libertador* as a supplement to the letters already published in 1929 and 1930. After the printing of what appeared to be a complete collection of the letters of Bolívar others were found and were given to the public in different numbers of the Bulletins of the Academy of History of Venezuela. Now for the convenience of students Vicente Lecuna has brought these together in a single volume, adding pertinent official documents for a better understanding of Bolívar's private correspondence and a number of photographs of paintings of the Liberator and scenes from his life. The most interesting section is the group of letters pertaining to the well-known but little understood meeting between Bolívar and San Martín at Guayaquil. To the editor, Vicente Lecuna, these letters clearly show the right of the Columbia of that day to the possession of the province which became Ecuador, although it is difficult to find out where San Martín came by the right to give it or to mark off boundaries between Columbia and Peru. Moreover, the same letter, (which is given in the introduction as that of August 29, 1822, but appears on page 229 as of July 29, 1822,) clearly refutes the charge that Bolívar refused aid to San

Martín, since the former mentions the number of Columbians going with San Martín as 1,800. The volume is a very useful addition to the Bolívar shelf. It was printed by The Colonial Press of New York.

* * * *

Wisconsin Magazine of History has been all of a bib and tucker during 1948 over the celebration of the Wisconsin centennial of statehood. Certainly the State Historical Society of Wisconsin can be proud of the part it played in making the citizens of the Badger State more conscious of their historical treasures. Clifford L. Lord, Editor of *Wisconsin Magazine of History* has a brief survey of the manner in which the centennial was celebrated throughout the State. This is his "Chats with the Editor" appearing in the September, 1948, number.

Among the many articles written in honor of the hundredth anniversary was the historical essay *The Catholic Story of Wisconsin* by the Reverend Benjamin J. Blied, Professor of History in St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee. It is published in a booklet of thirty-four pages divided into five parts, each tracing along broad lines a phase in the progress of Christianity in Wisconsin

* * * *

The Inca Concept of Sovereignty and the Spanish Administration in Peru, by Charles Gibson, and *Some Educational and Anthropological Aspects of Latin America*, a group of seven papers, are Latin-American Studies IV and V, published in 1948 by The University of Texas Institute of Latin-American Studies, and printed by The University of Texas Press, Austin. Mr. Gibson's book is paper bound in 146 pages including an ample bibliography, glossary, and index. It is a good investigation, revealing how the Inca's ideas of a ruler and reign differed from the Spaniard's and how historians have transferred their terminology of administration and sovereignty to a system in Peru that was basically different from that obtaining in Spain. What would work among the Spaniards would not work among the Inca, and *vice versa*. In attempting to harmonize the old and the new deals in Peru during the sixteenth century the Spaniards engaged in some ingenious political, social, and religious planning, using the trial and error method in their experimentation. The seven papers published in Studies V were originally read in a lecture series in 1947 given in the University of Texas. They are by Harold Benjamin, I. L. Kandel, Ernesto Galarza, Erna Fergusson, Donald D. Brand, Alfred L. Kroeber, and Paul Kirchhoff.

Michigan History for September, 1948, has among its articles "Glimpses of Michigan, 1840-60," by Willis F. Dunbar, who indicates that in studying the frontier historians are neglecting the "village frontier." Irving I. Katz has a biographical sketch on "Ezekiel Solomon: The First Jew in Michigan."

"Over the Santa Fe Trail Through Kansas in 1858," appears in *The Kansas Historical Quarterly* of November, 1948. This is a translation of Chapters 35 to 38 inclusive of Volume II of H. B. Möllhausen's *Reisen in die Felsengebirge Nord-Amerikas bis zum Hoch-Plateau von Neu-Mexico . . .* by Professor John A. Burzle, edited and annotated by Professor Robert Taft.

Following a trend over the country in that direction, the *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* of October, 1948, carries a study of "Populism in Washington," by Gordon B. Ridgeway, from its beginnings to its demise in 1900.

Sixty articles on medicine and the medical history of Ohio have appeared during the past ten years in *The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*; five of these research studies are in the October 1948 number. Pursuing a program launched ten years ago the Ohio State Museum has accumulated a large collection of materials pertaining to the growth of the science of medicine, such as proceedings of medical organizations, books, diaries, instruments, and drugs.

Gracing the cover of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* for September, 1948, are three pictures of images of members of the first families of early Illinois. These are explained in a paper by Thorne Deuel, Director of the Illinois State Museum, entitled "Illinois Records of 1000 A.D." The records are statuettes, tools, implements, and skeletons, trinkets, pottery, and utensils, of which a number of photographs are given. Mr. Deuel is not at all certain of the date 1000 as the year when the mound-builders flourished.

"The Cult of the Gaucho and the Creation of a Literature," by Edward Larocque Tinker, appeared in *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, Volume 57, Part 2. After a brief character sketch of the gaucho of the La Plata area, which would seem to make him a begrimed half-breed, nomadic, outside the law, and, in fine, a "despised cattle rustler," Mr. Tinker shows how he got into romanitic literature and poetry by reason of his patriotic fighting in the wars for democracy and has thus been transformed into a national hero, a symbol of courage, self-reliance, and patriotism.